


UNIVERSITY
OF FLORIDA
LIBRARIES



GREENE & Co.
NEW & SECOND-HAND BOOKSELLERS
16, CLARE STREET,
DUBLIN.





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

THE IRISH
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD

A Monthly Journal, under Episcopal Sanction

VOLUME XXIX
JANUARY TO JUNE, 1911

Fourth Series

DUBLIN
BROWNE & NOLAN, LIMITED, NASSAU STREET
1911

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Nihil Obstat

TERENTIUS O'DONNELL, S.T.D.,
Censor Dep.

Imprimi potest :

✠ GULIELMUS,
Archiep. Dublinen.,
Hiberniae Primas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
A Recent Confirmation of the Scapular Tradition. By Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J.	604
Arians and the Greek Schism, The. By 'Senanus'	178
Barnacle on Days of Fast and Abstinence, The. By Rev. D. F. M'Crea, M.R.I.A.	611
Biblical Memories in Palestine : Old Testament. By Rev. James P. Conry	507
Blessed Virgin, An Irish Hymn to the. By Rev. Paul Walsh	172
Carmelites, <i>The New Encyclopædia Britannica</i> and the Monastic Traditions of the. By Rev. James P. Rushe, O.D.C.	29
Cashel, Pre-Reformation Archbishops of. By W. H. Grattan Flood, M.U.S.D., K.S.G.	163
Catholic Church in 1910, The. By Rev. James MacCaffrey, D.P.H., S.T.L.	I
Celtic Missionary Saints, Some. By Rev. W. H. Kirwan	449
Church and State in Portugal, Separation of. By Francis M'Cullagh	595
Communion of Saints in the Primitive Church, The. By Rev. W. B. O'Dowd	52, 481
Correspondence :—	
The Priests of Mary	665
Death—Real and Apparent. By Rev. John J. Sheridan, C.C.	363
Decree <i>Ne Temere</i> , Catholic Marriage Laws and the. By Very Rev. J. F. Hogan, D.D.	196
'Denominations, Non-Catholic.' By Rev. M. J. O'Donnell, D.D.	251
Documents :—	
Abesses and other Perpetual Superiors of Convents outside Italy	204
Address of His Holiness Pope Pius X. to the Franciscan Fathers	317
Anniversary of Election or Translation of Bishop, Collect on Archconfraternity of Our Lady of Lourdes	103
Books of Liturgical Chant	322
Conversion of England, Extension of Sodality of Prayer for Decree relating to Removal of Parish Priests binding in England and the United States	555
Decree relating to Removal of Parish Priests binding in England and the United States	329
Dominican House in Rome, The New	552
Excommunication of three English Priests	321
Faculties to Dispense in Age and Interstices granted to Irish Bishops	327
Irish Bishops	666

DOCUMENTS— <i>continued.</i>	PAGE
Indulgence for Members of the Sodality of the Holy Childhood	552
Indulgences, Validity of	213
Instruction to Ordinaries relating to Condition of Freedom in regard to Matrimony	556
Lay-brothers, Decree of Sacred Congregation of Religious regarding	657
Letters of His Holiness Pope Pius X. :—	
To the Archbishop of Bogota	212
To the Archbishop of Compostella	666
To the Archbishop of Parma	215
To Cardinal Aguirra y Garcia, Archbishop of Toledo	324
To the Duke of Norfolk	321
To Archbishop Christie of Oregon	321
To Count Verspeyen	333
Condemning an Article of Prince Maximilian of Bavaria	548
To Cardinal Gibbons	557
Mass in Portiuncula	426
Medal in place of Scapulars	325
New Diocese of Simla	100
New Vicariate in East Africa	102
Oath against Modernism—Time for taking it	554
Oath of a Doctor of Sacred Scripture	29
Oath of the 'Motu Proprio' <i>Sacrorum Antistitum</i>	552
Oblates of the Immaculate Virgin—Rules of the Institute	210
Pious Society of Priestly Reparation	214
Relaxation of Law of Abstinence in Scotland	328
Religious obliged to serve in the Army, Decree relating to	429
Sacred Congregation of Religious, Publication of Decrees of Temporal Administration of Clerics, Decree of S. Cong. of the Consistory	665 216
Transvaal, New Vicariate Apostolic in	332
Vatican Edition of Liturgical Books	432
Wreaths made of wood or metal on the Altar	323
Education in Spain. By Very Rev. M. J. O'Doherty, D.D.	236
Erasmus and the Movements of his Time. By Rev. J. F. D'Alton, M.A., D.D.	561
Ethical Problems of the Future. By Rev. D. O'Keeffe, M.A.	14, 146
Fast and Abstinence, The Barnacle on Days of. By Rev. D. F. M'Crea, M.R.I.A.	611
Fragment from <i>Leabhar Breac</i> . By mac eclairpe	289
General Elections, 1826-1911, Ireland in the. By R. Barry O'Brien, B.L.	395
Glimpses of the Penal Times. By Rev. Reginald Walsh, O.P.	128
Greek Schism, The Arians and the. By 'Senanus'	178
<i>Leabhar Breac</i> , Fragment from. By mac eclairpe	289
Historical Standpoint, The 'Scapular Promise' from the. By Rev. James P. Rushe, O.D.C.	266
Holy Week in Spain. By Very Rev. M. J. O'Doherty, D.D.	355

	PAGE
Ireland in the General Elections, 1826-1911. By R. Barry O'Brien, B.L.	395
Irenæus and the Church of Rome. By Rev. James MacCaffrey, D.P.H., S.T.L.	225
Irish Hymn to the Blessed Virgin, An. By Rev. Paul Walsh	172
Irish Hymns, Three. By Rev. Paul Walsh	523
Marriage Laws, Catholic, and the Decree <i>Ne Temere</i> . By Very Rev. J. F. Hogan, D.D.	196
Mass, The Mozarabic. By Rev. P. J. Bradley, B.D., B.C.L.	625
Monastic Traditions of the Carmelites, <i>The New Encyclopædia Britannica</i> and the. By Rev. James P. Rushe, O.D.C.	29
Mozarabic Mass, The. By Rev. P. J. Bradley, B.D., B.C.L.	625
'Non-Catholic Denominations.' By Rev. M. J. O'Donnell, D.D.	251

Notes and Queries:—

CANON LAW (By Rev. M. J. O'Donnell, D.D.)—


Administration of Ecclesiastical Property and Endowments	86
Clerics, The Temporal Administration of	639
Craniotomy and Excommunication	537
Law regarding ordinary Confessor for Nuns	413
New Impediments to Religious Profession	304
No Man Judge in his own Case	91
Ordination <i>extra tempora</i>	411
Ordination of Non-Subjects	411
Passing from one Order to Another	540
Powers of 'Formula Sexta' in regard to Ordination	411
Roman Congregations and certain Confraternities	535
Suspension <i>ex informata conscientia</i>	644
Testimonial Letters for Ordination	538

LITURGY (By Very Rev. P. Morrisroe, D.D.)—

Blessed Candles, Selling	654
Communion Holy Saturday	423
Coloured underground on Alb-sleeves and Fringes	95
Covering of Scapulars	94
Exposition of Blessed Sacrament on Holy Thursday	422
Holy Souls as Titular of Churches	650
Holy Thursday and Good Friday Functions, Hymns at	649
Inscription of Names in Scapular Confraternities	418, 543
Lessons of First Nocturn in Offices of Irish Patron Saints	207
Medal-Scapulars, General Decree on	314
Musical Instruments in Church	205
Prayers in 'Missa Quotidiana' and Form for giving Holy Communion	96
Prie-Dieu, Use of at Benediction, and Chair in Preaching	96
Private 'Requiem' Masses	546, 648
Recognition of Faculties for Indulgencing Pious Objects	420
Sabbatine Indulgence	98
Scapular-Medal	314
Souls in Purgatory, Power of Intercession of	650
Vestments to be worn by Preacher	425

NOTES AND QUERIES— <i>continued.</i>	PAGE
THEOLOGY (By Rev. J. M. Harty, D.D.)—	
Clandestine Marriages between Catholics—Are they valid	
Civil Contracts if all Legal conditions have been fulfilled?	297
Coining—Does a Coiner sin against strict Justice?	81
‘Disparitas Cultus’	82
Doubtful fulfilment of Statutory Condition of Age	301
Mass in Private and Semi-Public Oratories	80
Moral Principles of the <i>Tablet</i>	203
Obligations of Clergy to know and act on New Decrees	300
Old Age Pensions	301
Penalty for Violation of New Marriage Law	294
Public Propriety	83
Saturday Night Dances	299
<i>Tablet</i> , The—Significant omission and grave misrepresentation	84
The Short Form of Extreme Unction and Recent Medical Theories	300
 Notices of Books:—	
At Home with God, Prie-Dieu Papers on Spiritual Subjects, 221; Back to Holy Church, 108; Bishop de Mazenod, his Inner Life and Virtues, 224; Blessed Joan of Arc, 112; Catholic Encyclopedia, The, 669; Christianity and the Leaders of Modern Science, 669; Commentarii Theologici, 111; Companions of the Way, 224; Early Steps in the Fold, 221; Francis de Sales: A Study, 223; From Washington to Roosevelt, 434; Gemma Galgani, 670; Handbuch zur Biblischen Geschichte, 442; Home Rule Finance, 668; Hymns and Poems, 111; Institutiones Morales Alphonsianae, 559; Jacquetta, 219; Les Chrétientés Celtiques, 559; Launcelot Andrews and the Reaction, 222; Meditationes de Praecipuis Fidei Nostrae Mysteriis, 444; Meditations for Every Day of the Year, 335; Mezzogiorno, 107; St. Brigid of Sweden, 223; Socialism and the Workingman, 671; Sorrow for Sin: Must it be supreme, 439; The Cost of a Crown, 110; The Day’s Burden: Studies Literary and Political, 105; The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, 334; The King’s Bell, 335; The Life of Blessed John Eudes, 217; The Life of Friedrich Nietzsche, 444; The Plain Gold Ring, 220; The Primacy of St. Peter, 334; The Principles of Moral Science, 435; The Rector and the Fathers, 442; The Story of St. Francis of Assisi, 224; The Via Vitae of St. Benedict, 222; ‘The Carolinian,’ 670.	
Palestine, Biblical Memories in: Old Testament. By Rev. James P. Conry	507
Penal Times, Glimpses of the. By Rev. Reginald Walsh, O.P.	128
Philosophy, Scholastic. By Rev. D. O’Keeffe, M.A.	370
Portugal, Separation of Church and State in. By Francis M’Cullagh	595

	PAGE
Pragmatic Value of Theism, The. By Rev. Leslie J. Walker, S.J.	337, 464, 575
Pre-Reformation Archbishops of Cashel, The. By W. H. Grattan Flood, MUS.D., K.S.G.	163
Primitive Church, The Communion of Saints in the. By Rev. W. B. O'Dowd	52, 481
Problems of the Future, Ethical. By Rev. D. O'Keeffe, M.A.	14, 146
Religious Orders, Spain and its. By Very Rev. M. J. O'Doherty, D.D.	65
Rome, Irenæus and the Church of. By Rev. James MacCaffrey, D.PH., S.T.L.	225
Saints, Some Celtic Missionary. By Rev. W. H. Kirwan	449
'Scapular Promise' from the Historical Standpoint. By Rev. James P. Rushe, O.D.C.	266
Scapular Tradition, A Recent Confirmation of the. By Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J.	604
Scapular Tradition and its Defenders, The. By Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J.	492
Scholastic Philosophy. By Rev. D. O'Keeffe, M.A.	370
Spain and its Religious Orders. By Very Rev. M. J. O'Doherty, D.D.	65
Spain, Education in. By Very Rev. M. J. O'Doherty, D.D.	236
Spain, Holy Week in. By Very Rev. M. J. O'Doherty, D.D.	355
Students Afield, University. By Rev. James P. Clenaghan, B.A.	113
The Catholic Church in 1910. By Rev. James MacCaffrey, D.PH., S.T.L.	I
Theism, The Pragmatic Value of. By Rev. Leslie J. Walker, S.J.	337, 464, 575
Three Irish Hymns. By Rev. Paul Walsh	523
Tradition, Scapular, and its Defenders. By Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J.	492
University Students Afield. By Rev. James P. Clenaghan, B.A.	113



THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN 1910

THE year 1910 has passed without any serious political complications. There were, indeed, difficulties in regard to the Balkan Provinces, the annexations of Austria, the position of Crete, the policy of the Young Turkish party, and the commercial relations of certain territories in Africa lying along the Mediterranean, but these difficulties have not proved too great for the powers of diplomacy. In European politics the most startling events were the revolution in Portugal and the progress of the constitutional struggle in Great Britain. The former was not unexpected. Since the assassination of King Carlos in February, 1908, the establishment of a republic was felt to be only a matter of time and opportunity. The progress of the latter was interrupted by the death of King Edward and the accession of a new sovereign, but the conference, having failed to arrive at a solution, the prime minister deemed it his duty to submit the question to the judgment of the electors. As far as can be seen from the returns of the electoral contests, the country has approved of the Liberal policy. The position of the House of Lords in the English constitution is admittedly something of an anomaly, and it only required that public attention should be fixed upon the hereditary principle and the right of absolute veto to bring about a revision of its constitution or its powers, or possibly of both.

For the Catholic Church it has not been a year of peace.

The alarming spread of secularism and of religious indifference, the influence of the Socialists and Anarchists, and the international secret combinations are largely responsible for the warfare which is being waged against the Catholic position. In France the enemies of religion secured the first real success, well knowing that where France led the Latin nations were likely to follow. That their hopes were amply justified may be seen in the progress of events in Spain, in Portugal, and in Italy during the past few years.

The position of the Holy Father, Pius X., has been a particularly painful one. Hardly a day has passed when he did not find himself involved in new troubles. The situation even in Rome itself is sufficiently galling. A Jewish mayor and an anti-religious municipality rule the capital of the Catholic world. They have prohibited religious education in the primary schools; they have refused to allow the use of the school buildings for religious instruction; they have set even the very residence of the Cardinal-Vicar to be used for advertising purposes; they have encouraged celebrations like the Giordano Bruno celebrations in February, and allowed the Giordano Bruno association to establish its head-quarters close to the Vatican; they have assisted proselytizers like the American Methodists to carry on their unholy propaganda under the very eyes of the Vicar of Christ. Signor Nathan, encouraged by his successes, was permitted to attack the Pope in the most scurrilous language—language which has been condemned by the whole Catholic world, and which is regarded as a violation of the Law of Guarantees even by such a patriotic Italian as General Pelloux.

Yet, in spite of these anti-religious outbursts of the Roman municipality, and notwithstanding their well-recognized maladministration, the great body of the electors abstained from recording their votes, and the *Bloc* was allowed a walk-over. Nor can the Court well interfere to prevent such insults to the Holy Father, for the position of the king is of such a perilous character that the alienation of the Radical party might lead to a revolution. Since last December prime ministers and cabinets have succeeded

one another in rapid succession. Signor Gioletti fell in his attempts to equalize taxation. He wished to reduce the taxes on sugar and other necessaries of life, and to supply the deficit by increased income taxes and death duties, but the senate was not prepared for such a democratic measure. To Gioletti succeeded the government of Baron Sonnino, who was something of a Conservative, and too much of a 'Clerical' to satisfy the Radical section. Finally, Signor Luzzati agreed to accept the responsibilities and emoluments of office and to give some of the leading opponents of the Church a seat in the ministry. His policy is frankly opposition to the Church. He declared, indeed, that while he could not allow any interference of the Church in politics he would not, on the other hand, tolerate any scheme of persecution. Yet the proposal to take the control of primary education from the hands of the district or communal authorities is hardly in accordance with this impartial programme. It is simply a plan to destroy the religious character of the schools, even in places where, as at present, the local authorities are anxious to combine secular and religious instruction.

Yet, however painful to him the trend of affairs in Rome and in Italy, Pius X. pursues unflinchingly his schemes of reform. Many of the subjects dealt with in the recent *Motu proprio* and decrees of the Holy Father were included in the matters that would have been submitted to the Vatican Council had it been allowed to continue its deliberations. As it is unlikely that circumstances will permit the convocation of a general council for years, the Pope has judged it wise to proceed immediately with the more urgent questions of reform. During the past year his decrees and encyclicals deal with the new regulations for the visitation *ad limina*, and with the particulars of the *relatio* that is then required; with the method of procedure in case of the retirement of parish priests; with the relations which the clergy should maintain towards co-operative banks, savings banks, and other similar organizations; with the conditions for the reception of the Holy Eucharist by children; and, finally, with the Modernist

movement and the campaign of *Le Sillon* in France. These are only a few of the many important regulations issued by the Holy Father during the current year, but they are sufficient to prove that neither age nor anxiety has interfered with his vigour and activity.

The course of events in Spain and Portugal occasioned the greatest uneasiness to those interested in religion, or in the real welfare of these two countries. Since the fall of Señor Maura in connexion with the Mellila campaign and immediately after the Ferrer outburst the Liberal party of Spain have been in the ascendant. Maura had at any rate a programme of reform. He wished to secure the freedom of elections—something that is unknown in Spain—compulsory voting for all entitled to exercise the franchise, regulation of the hours of labour for women and children, Sunday's rest, and the establishment and proper maintenance of state hospitals and sanatoriums. On the fall of the Maura cabinet Señor Moret assumed responsibility. He was obliged to fall back on the Radicals and Republicans for support, a policy which was disliked by the king, more especially after the Republicans' capture of many of the municipalities. The result was the fall of Moret and the appointment of Señor Canalejas, the inspirer of the anti-clerical decrees of 1906. He put forward a good, popular platform, equalizing taxation more especially by State appropriation of the unearned increment, old age pensions, universal military service, and the abolition of inland tariffs. In the elections the Liberals were victorious, though on account of the multitude of political parties in Spain it is no easy matter to calculate the results. They numbered in the new chamber 227, as against 105 Conservatives, 9 Carlists, and 40 Republicans; and it is worthy of note that in Madrid and in Barcelona the Republicans and Socialists secured their triumphs. In the senate the parties were divided in much the same proportion, 103 Liberals, 42 Conservatives, and 4 Republicans.

The prime minister, Canalejas, adopted a policy of hostility to the Church. He allowed the victorious 'lay schools,' which had been closed since the Ferrer incident,

to be re-opened. These free schools were first established in Barcelona about the year 1880 by an association organized for the purpose. They were frankly anti-Christian, and aimed at destroying religion, especially among the lower classes. Hence in many cases they were established in connexion with working-men's clubs. Their numbers rapidly increased, especially after 1890, when their constitution underwent a radical change, and in many cases they received financial assistance from the local authorities wherever these were favourable to the organizers of lay education. According to the reports there were fifty such schools in different parts of Spain in 1906, and between that date and the attempted revolution in Barcelona fully fifty more had been established. Señor Maura closed these institutions on account of their connexion with the revolutionary movement, but, despite the united protests of the Spanish hierarchy, Señor Canalejas allowed them to be re-opened.

In defiance of the articles of the Concordat he secured the publication of a royal decree permitting complete freedom of worship to all religious bodies in Spain, and authorizing them to erect churches and to display on them religious emblems. The Pope naturally resented the publication of such a decree, not so much on account of the substance of the concessions as on account of the form in which these concessions had been made. The royal decree was an infringement of the Concordat, and involved an important principle, namely, whether one of the contracting parties to such an agreement is at liberty to disavow the articles contained in it without the consent of the other. He proceeded, too, to begin a campaign against the religious orders by attempting to revive the proposed Associations Bill of earlier years, and this too without any previous consultation with the Vatican. The Pope had again and again expressed his willingness to consider any reasonable demands presented to him by the Spanish government, but the prime minister was determined to assert the principle of State supremacy in such matters.

The state of affairs in Spain was rapidly becoming ex-

ceedingly critical. It looked for a time as if a complete rupture were to take place between Madrid and the Vatican, an event which in all likelihood would have been followed by civil war. The country was not ripe, as the prime minister soon realized, for an anti-clerical campaign. Monster demonstrations were organized by the Catholic leaders. The great national meeting summoned at San Sebastian was indeed proclaimed, but on the other hand the government did not dare to forbid the series of meetings organized throughout Spain on Sunday, October 2. They were meant to be an exhibition of the Catholic strength in the country, and as such they were eminently successful. In Navarre, the Basque Provinces, Aragon, Leon—in a word, everywhere in Spain—the size and enthusiasm of the meetings exceeded all expectation.

The prime minister was alarmed at the progress of this movement, and the young king must have felt reluctant to enter into a struggle with the very men upon whom he must rely in his battle with the Socialists and Republicans. Señor Canalejas did indeed proceed with his new law against religious associations, but it was of a different character from the measure originally proposed. It forbade provincial governors to allow the foundation of a new religious congregation unless such a body had received previously the approval of the minister of worship, an approval which could not be given by the minister if the religious body contained a certain percentage of foreigners. Even in regard to this law the prime minister held out rather friendly proposals, which are likely to permit the re-establishment of more friendly relations with Rome and the peaceful solution of the difficulty. One thing at any rate is perfectly clear to any impartial observer, that if a civil war should break out in the present temper of the Spanish people the monarchy and not the Church has good reason to fear the result.

In Portugal the long-expected revolution has at length arrived. The House of Braganza, which has ruled Portugal since the famous conspiracy of October, 1640, has fallen, and a provisional government, with Theophilo Braga as

president, now rules in Lisbon. For this revolution political not religious causes are primarily responsible, though in the actual frenzy of the fight the movement assumed a decidedly anti-clerical character. The two leading Royalist parties, the *Progressistas* and *Regeneradores*, were accustomed to take office in turn, with the object of enriching themselves at the public expense. In order to put a stop to this system of 'Rotavism,' as it was called, King Carlos suspended the constitution, and appointed Senhor Franco dictator, a step which cost him his life in February, 1908. The young King Manoel, on his accession, restored the constitution; the old system of 'Rotavism' was re-established, and the signs of public discontent grew more alarming and distinct. With the object of placating the more extreme sections the king turned from the Royalists, and called to office Teixeira de Souza, the leader of the Liberals. In the elections which followed in August the Royalist vote was consequently split and the Republicans captured Madrid. The preparations for the revolution were made openly under the eyes of the ministers. Arms were introduced into the city, the loyalty of the officers of the army and navy was sapped by the Freemason society, and of the men by the *Carbonaria*. When the revolution broke out the king found himself deserted by his ministers and cabinet. The loyal troops had nobody to lead them in the struggle; for the king, instead of placing himself at their head, or, at least, of falling back towards Oporto, where he might have rallied his forces, allowed himself to be persuaded to seek safety in flight.

The anti-religious character of the movement is easily understood by anyone acquainted with the modern ecclesiastical history of Portugal. It was Emmanuel I. and Pombal who sowed the seed which is now being reaped. Under the guise of liberalism in religion they encouraged the spread of the French anti-religious literature of the school of Voltaire, packed the schools, especially the University of Coimbra, with free-thinking professors, favoured the foundation of Freemason lodges, expelled the Jesuits, grabbed the Inquisition, and by these means corrupted the

professional and middle classes, and, we fear, a fair proportion even of the clergy. They in turn spread the poison amongst the people, who were deceived by the programme of democratic freedom and war upon the Church. Liberty and irreligion went hand in hand in the days of the revolution and Napoleonic wars, as also in the dark days of the civil strife between the Freemason, Liberal, anti-Catholic Dom Pedro, and the Catholic but Conservative Dom Migoel. The Church was on the wrong side: it was identified with the vanquished absolutism of Dom Migoel, and had to pay the penalty.

Its Bishops have been the nominees of the State, and have at all times shown themselves more loyal to the king than to the Pope. They are, at best, only figure-heads. The real government of the Church is in the hands of the minister of worship. He it is whom the clergy must please if they wish to receive promotion, and secure in his good graces they could practically bid defiance to their ecclesiastical superiors. No wonder, then, if the clergy of Portugal are not distinguished for the virtues which should fit them for their holy office. The seminaries, too, were formerly in the complete control of the government. The ministers appointed the professors, selected the text-books, prescribed the courses, watched over the examination and discipline, and, in a word, decided who should be promoted to orders and who should be kept back. Since 1883, it is true, this has been changed, but the arts education of the seminarians is still under the care of the State lyceums, and the fact that so many of the ecclesiastical students have abandoned their studies since the revolution, and have formed an association for the spread of free-thought, is a fair indication of the training which they receive in the government lyceums.

In these circumstances one can hardly expect religion to be flourishing in Portugal; but when it is furthermore remembered that the Church had no voice even in the primary schools, that the teachers passed through their professional courses in the godless normal colleges, that many of them were secretly allied with the Socialist-Radical

party, that no religious instruction of any kind was permitted in the colleges, and that the University of Coimbra was a hot-bed of Positivism, is it to be wondered at that many of the people were at the beck of the violent politico-religious demagogues? These men told them of the great wealth of the Church, especially of the religious orders; they represented these latter bodies as sucking the very life-blood of the country, as hovering round the beds of the dying to see how much they could grab, as being the cause of the poverty and downfall of Portugal; they employed their agents to secure membership for the dangerous secret society known as the *Carbonaria Portuguezza*, and the equally dangerous Freemason lodges, and when the outburst came the result was as might be expected. The vilest dregs of society came on top during the early days of the revolution, and they showed themselves worthy of their instructions and instructors. The provisional government is established. It has decreed the suppression of the religious orders; it has arranged divorce on a plan which would challenge comparison with even the laxest State of the American union; and it is preparing a drastic measure for the separation of Church and State. But the last word has not yet been spoken in Portugal. The Braganzas may never again return to the country from which their descendant has fled, but most moderate men will be inclined to think that Theophilo Braga and the crowd of lawyers, journalists, poets, and philosophers who now govern Portugal are not likely to remain in power. The people will soon learn that one tyrant is not worse than ten, and that the dictatorship of Senhor Franco was at least as good as that of the provisional government.

With the other countries space does not permit us to deal at length. In France the Republic has had its own troubles during the past year. What with the strikes organized by the Confederation of Labour, the association of the postal servants, the strikes of the railway employees, of the marines and reservists at Nîmes, the liquidation scandals of M. Duez, and the financial scandals of the notorious company-promoter, M. Rochette, the rising waters

of the Seine, and the robberies of the Paris street-bandits, the decline of the birth-rate, and the consequent decline of the quotas for military service, obliging the government to employ black troops in Algeria, M. Briand and his colleagues have had their time sufficiently employed to prevent them engaging in a new anti-religious campaign.

Still it is clear that M. Briand has the support of the country. In the elections in May his groups were returned with increased strength, though it should be remembered that on the eve of the elections he foreshadowed an era of reconciliation. He has since, however, continued his work in regard to education. His proposals are directed not indeed towards the open suppression of the free schools, for the French people are not prepared for that. By introducing Government inspection and stringent regulations regarding the qualifications of the teachers and the organization of their work, he hopes to make the position of the free schools untenable, and to prevent their further development. By the other measures for the protection of the teachers in the neutral schools, and the punishment of the parents who seek to protect the faith of their children by objecting to the teachers or the text-books, he is vindicating the principle accepted as an axiom by the present rulers of France, namely, that the education of the children is the right not of the parent but of the State.

Some special misfortune seems to be hanging over the Catholics of France. Every effort which they make to organize their forces is certain to miscarry just at the moment when it promised to be successful. Sometimes it is royalism is the trouble, at another republicanism or socialism. This time it is religion. The Pope has felt it necessary to condemn *Le Sillon*. This movement was established about twelve years ago by Marc Sangnier, with the object of arousing the younger generation of Catholics to a sense of their duties as citizens and as Catholics. His programme was a programme of social reform. He meant to stir up the young men, lay and cleric, to take an interest in the working classes, and indirectly to win them back to the practice of the religion of their fathers. The idea was

taken up with the greatest enthusiasm. Hardly a young priest or a young seminarian who was not a member of the Sillon movement; the laymen were not less ardent in the work, and in a short time the society was spread throughout France.

At first, though many viewed it with suspicion, hardly anybody took the field against it. But latterly, owing to the way in which questions of religion and social reform were being mixed, owing to the fact that non-Catholics were admitted freely to the 'Greater Sillon'—for there was a Greater Sillon and a Lesser Sillon—and owing to the claims of absolute independence that were put forward by the society, several of the Bishops spoke out strongly against it, while others were equally strong in their approval of the movement. The question, then, was obviously one which must be referred to Rome. Pius X., while praising the work and the intentions of the society and of the founder, insists that it cannot continue as it is, and that it must be placed under the government of the Bishops in their respective dioceses. Marc Sangnier, to his credit be it said, immediately submitted to the decision of the Church, and thus set an example which has been imitated loyally by his followers.

In Germany and Austria the Catholic position is unchanged. The most serious loss the Catholics of Austria suffered was the death of Dr. Lueger, the Burgomaster of Vienna and the head of the Christian Democrat Party in the Empire. When he began his campaign Vienna, and indeed Austria, was at the mercy of the Jewish capitalists. He had against him the emperor and many of the highest of the Austrian ecclesiastics, but he had one friend who stood loyal to him in all his difficulties, and that was Cardinal Agliardi, the Papal Nuncio at the Court of Francis Joseph. He it was who countered the moves of Lueger's opponents and prevented the success of their intrigues at Rome. Lueger drove the Liberal-Jewish party out of Vienna, and broke their power in Austria. His party was the strongest party in the Reichsrath. Francis Joseph, who once on a time refused to receive Lueger when elected Burgomaster of Vienna, lived to realize that he had no more loyal and

more useful subject. He regretted his death just as much as did the poor of Vienna. In the person of his successor, Aloysius Lichtenstein, the Christian Democrat Party of Austria has received as leader a man who is likely to continue the programme which the dead leader so lucidly sketched even on his death-bed.

In Belgium the elections have once again been favourable to the Catholics. They have retained their majority: a narrow one, it is true, but yet sufficient to enable them to carry out their reforms. What is of equal importance is that, if we can judge by the selection of ministers, the threatened split between the younger and older sections of Belgian Catholics has been averted and MM. Woeste and Helleputte are likely to go hand in hand. In Holland the Cabinet of Heemskerke, in which three Catholics find a place, still holds the field. It has done good work in regard to secondary education. It has secured State aid to the free denominational colleges, and thus in Protestant Holland Catholic primary and secondary schools are supported out of public funds. Catholics are, too, permitted by law to establish, if they wish, a Catholic University, the degrees of which will be recognized by the State.

The two great events of the year in the United States were undoubtedly the Eucharistic Congress at Montreal and the solemn consecration of the Cathedral of St. Patrick in New York. The former of these, though held on Canadian soil, owes much of its success to the United States, but of course the greater share of the work and the honour rests with the Canadians. The latter was an event that was ardently desired by the Catholics, not alone of New York but also of the entire States. They longed to see the day when the cathedral, having been set free from debt, could be solemnly consecrated for ever to divine service. His Grace, the Most Rev. Dr. Farley, is to be congratulated on the success of his labours and upon the display of Catholic strength which was witnessed in the city of New York on the day appointed for the ceremony. It was fitting, too, that he should find by his side on that occasion Cardinal Vannutelli, the representative of the Pope, to whom American

Catholics are so loyal and devoted, and Cardinal Logue, the Primate of the Irish Church, the exiled children of which have done so much for the beautiful cathedral erected in honour of their national patron.

In Ireland we can congratulate ourselves on the abolition of the Royal Declaration. It is satisfactory for us to know that no future king of England is likely to characterize his Catholic subjects as idolators. It is a matter for rejoicing too that the difficulties which threatened to impede the progress of our National University have been amicably arranged; that the great body of Catholic students, true to the Irish traditions, have enrolled their names on its registers, and that the County Councils of Ireland are acting in accordance with their promises and rallying to its support. In face of these facts there is every reason to hope that it will be worthy of its name, and become a great intellectual centre, calculated to improve the religious, educational, and social interests of Ireland.

JAMES MACCAFFREY.

ETHICAL PROBLEMS OF THE FUTURE—II

ONE passes almost into a new world of philosophic thought—more complex, elaborate, and many-sided—in turning from Mill's *Utilitarianism* to the *Methods of Ethics* of the late Professor Sidgwick. The change is intimately connected with the passing over of philosophical speculation into an academic *milieu*. Hitherto the English philosophers of name had been for the most part unconnected with the universities. Bentham, the Mills, and Spencer were decidedly unacademic. But the interest in philosophical questions, which their influence did so much to revive, and increasing familiarity with foreign work in this department, inevitably tended towards a professionalizing of philosophical studies. This professionalism, whilst it undoubtedly promotes a certain logical nicety, an academic *finesse*, in argument and discussion, is often enough (though this was certainly not the case with Sidgwick) accompanied by a narrowness of outlook upon life, and an artificial interest in the process of philosophizing rather than in its results. It is amazing how uniformly philosophical writers suppress the questions of deep and vital import, the problems that most persistently claim an answer. The amazing affectation of overlooking metaphysical questions altogether, from the effects of which we are still suffering, is an admirable case in point. True, we vaguely feel these problems in the dim background of the thought of so-called advanced writers, and the pressure they exert becomes manifest at times, but often enough we are put off with evasions or involved in the intricacies of side questions. So the vital problems slip out of mind, and philosophy becomes, as James humorously suggests, merely a reiteration of 'what dusty-minded professors have written about what other previous professors have thought.'¹

¹ *A Pluralistic Universe*, p. 265.

Even in the case of Sidgwick we, perhaps, gather more of the genuine bent of his ethical interest from the outpourings of his mind in letters to friends or in his diary than from his published works on Ethics. Compared with the *Utilitarianism* the *Methods of Ethics* appears strangely uninspired. This is due not merely to the academic form of the work or to its careful and guarded utterances. It arises more than anything else from those aspects of Sidgwick's ethical teaching in which he is decidedly superior to Mill. The logical difficulties of Utilitarianism as an ethical system were vividly before the mind of Sidgwick. Where Mill had sketched in bold and sweeping outline, Sidgwick felt himself compelled to fill in the details. He must examine the various parts of the system and their interrelations in the light of more searching and, unhappily, more destructive logical and psychological principles. Moreover, his wider acquaintance with alternative ethical theories necessitated a deeper, keener, more subtle restatement of hedonistic views. Sidgwick, then, could not have the easy confidence of Mill in the logical coerciveness of utilitarianism. Lacking the sense of certainty and security in his theories, he naturally lacked decisiveness and boldness in his statement of them.

In the preface to the sixth edition of the *Methods of Ethics* there is an admirable account of the evolution of Sidgwick's thought upon the central problems of ethics, from which it seems clear that the moving force in his development came from his consciousness of the difficulty of reconciling what he calls 'Interest' and 'Duty,' that is, the egoistic and universalistic elements in the theory of Mill. How can it at once be reasonable to aim at *my own* pleasure and to subordinate everything else to its pursuit, if at the same time it is similarly reasonable to seek in all my actions the general pleasure of mankind or of sentient beings? To Mill, as we have already noticed, this problem did not appeal, or at least his optimism helped him to bridge the difficulty. He who gets most pleasure for himself (so in effect Mill informs us) is best consulting the general pleasure of mankind, and *vice versa*. Personal and

general pleasure are, in a word, coincident. No genuine conflict between them is possible. Hedonistic self-sacrifice and all the so-called heroisms of morality disappear—in fact become impossible. To aim at the 'pleasure of other people is seen (to the eye of the utilitarian) to be a roundabout way of looking for my own; in seeking their pleasure I am simply hunting out my own in a convenient but thin disguise.

This conclusion is delightfully simple, not to say consoling, but unhappily it will not bear minute examination. Sidgwick, in fact, after a close scrutiny of the relations between self-interest and social service as we may call them, reluctantly came to the conclusion that 'no complete solution of the conflict between my happiness and the general happiness was possible on the basis of mundane experience.'¹ But if it be once admitted that a conflict between my private pleasure and that of mankind as a whole is possible Mill's ethical system tumbles to pieces. For in case of such genuine conflict, why should I sacrifice *my own* pleasure to that of mankind?

I put aside Mill's phrases that such sacrifice was 'heroic' that it was not 'well' with me unless I was in a disposition to make it. I put to him in my mind the dilemma: Either it is for my own happiness or it is not. If not, why should I do it? It was no use to say that if I was a moral hero I should have formed a habit of willing actions beneficial to others which would remain in force, even with my own pleasure in the other scale. I knew that at any rate I was not the kind of moral hero who does this without reason; from *blind* habit. Nor did I even wish to be that kind of hero: for it seemed to me that that kind of hero, however admirable, was certainly not a philosopher. I must somehow *see* that it was right for me to sacrifice my happiness for the good of the whole of which I am a part.²

The pressure of this difficulty forced Sidgwick to seek for its solution in the fundamental intuition that it is right to seek the general pleasure. This must be taken to be

¹ *Methods of Ethics*, 6th edition, p. xvi.

² *Ibid.*, pp. xvi., xvii.

immediately evident, and thus a fusion of old-time oppositions may serve as the basis of a new and more comprehensive system. He sums up his ethical position in the happy phrase, 'a Utilitarian on an Intuitional basis':—

The Utilitarianism of Mill and Bentham seemed to me to want a basis: that basis could only be supplied by a fundamental intuition.

However complicated in its details, Sidgwick's theory in its main outlines can be stated in a few brief formulæ. He is 'a Utilitarian upon an Intuitional basis.' Where Mill had attempted a modified proof of utilitarianism Sidgwick rightly insists that proof of any kind is here impossible. Appeal must be made to an immediate intuition; the notion of obligation, the 'ought' of morality, is undervivable; 'the first principles of ethics must themselves be ethical.' Moreover, he explicitly rejects 'Psychological Hedonism' (the theory that men desire pleasure only) on the obvious ground that *de facto* men actually desire other objects besides pleasure, and hence Mill's attempted line of reasoning, that strange illogical fusion of contradictions, was not available for him. But now, not merely is the principle that I ought to seek the general pleasure of mankind ('Universalistic Hedonism') self-evident, but the principle that I ought to seek *my own* pleasure ('Egoistic Hedonism') seems to Sidgwick equally so. This had been insisted upon long before by Butler. The problem as to how both are to be held together obviously becomes urgent. To Sidgwick's eminently cautious mind the avoidance of the difficulty by an easy-going optimism did not appeal. And after careful examination he is driven to admit that it is only upon the postulate of a guiding providence and a moral order of the universe that we can have any reason to hope for their reconciliation. His theory, in a word, is a reconciliation of egoistic and universalistic hedonism, self-interest and duty, by the postulate of a guiding providence and a future life.

It is only, however, with the most extreme caution and with striking hesitancy that he ventures upon this postulate

in the concluding chapter of the *Methods of Ethics*. He shows with remarkable force and subtlety of argument¹ that 'the supposed inseparable connexion between Utilitarian Duty and the greatest happiness of the individual who conforms to it, cannot be satisfactorily demonstrated on empirical grounds.' But if morality is to be rationally justified some reconciliation is imperative. There seems just one way of meeting the difficulty in a manner satisfactory to the logical mind, and the last question of ethics then becomes this: Are we justified in accepting this reconciliation as a fact?

If, then, the reconciliation of duty and self-interest is to be regarded as a hypothesis logically necessary to avoid a fundamental contradiction in one chief department of our thought, it remains to ask how far this necessity constitutes a sufficient reason for accepting the hypothesis. This, however, is a profoundly difficult and controverted question, the discussion on which belongs rather to a treatise on General Philosophy than to a work on the *Methods of Ethics*: as it could not be satisfactorily answered, without a general examination of the criteria of true and false beliefs.²

It is not difficult in the light of this result to understand why Sidgwick's ethical work lacked moral inspiration. He had no definite moral creed to inculcate, and inspiration will not live upon doubt. We gain a deeper insight into the keenness of his interest in this vital problem from many passages in the very interesting *Memoir*. He writes to H. G. Dakyns, in February, 1873:—

Ethics is losing its interest for me rather, as the insolubility of its fundamental problem is impressed on me. I think the contribution to the formal clearness and coherence of our ethical thoughts which I have to offer is just worth giving: for a few speculatively-minded persons—very few.³

The importance of Sidgwick's conclusion cannot be overlooked. He definitely demonstrated by an irresistible line of proof that our moral life cannot be rationalized or sys-

¹ *Methods of Ethics*, Bk. ii. ch. v., and Bk. iv., concluding chapter.

² *Ibid.* 6th ed. pp. 506, 507.

³ *Henry Sidgwick: A Memoir*, p. 277.

tematized upon the basis of utilitarianism, without the postulate of immortality and a moral government of the universe. The efforts to construct an ethical system upon the basis of pleasure (confined to this mundane sphere) only appear valid so long as we fail to analyse their principles and compare them one with another. Unhappily, approaching the problem as he did, Sidgwick found no compelling reasons for belief in the postulate upon which the whole ethical edifice must rest :—

To a speculative mind [he writes] these questions [of the relation of duty and inclination, etc.] are no doubt more profoundly interesting than the others. Sometimes they become absorbingly so to me, but I rather turn aside from such contemplation of them, because I not only cannot answer them to my satisfaction, but do not even know where to look for the answer that I want. I am sincerely glad that so many of my fellow-creatures are satisfied with the answers that they get from positive religions ; and the others—philosophers—find a substitute for the satisfaction of an answer found, in the high and severe delight of seeking it. I cannot quite do either, and, therefore, I hold my tongue as much as I can.¹

The reference to the ‘philosophers’ is delightfully piquant, and not without its ‘sting’ of truth.

We have wandered somewhat from our main purpose in following out Sidgwick’s ethical thought, and now we return. How precisely does he stand related to the two-fold problem in which we are at present interested. He adopts, as we might expect, a cautious and balanced attitude. The need for a definite answer to these far-reaching questions was more clearly before his mind than it had been before the mind of Mill. Already an inevitable logic had begun to push them to the front ; they were, as we might say, already claimants for the focus of ethical attention. Sidgwick had brought to light many of the difficulties that lurk in utilitarianism as an ethical creed. And in doing so he became conscious that the theory involves some change in the meaning of the central conceptions of morality, and

¹ *Henry Sidgwick : A Memoir*, pp. 337, 338.

in addition that it requires to be shown in detail that the use of general social pleasure as the ethical criterion will give us the same moral code as ordinary Intuitionism. This latter question indeed became one of the chief tasks of the *Method of Ethics*.

We shall begin with a brief consideration of the change which the notions of 'duty,' 'obligation,' etc., undergo in his ethical system. And at a first glance it might appear that in this matter his theory offers a much more satisfactory solution than that of Mill. For to Sidgwick the principles of moral obligation appear to be self-evident, and hence we seem to have compassed the fundamental ideas of ethics at a single stroke. But a closer scrutiny of his system brings to light many difficulties. In his admirable chapter upon 'Free Will'¹ he discusses with much subtlety the bearings of Determinism upon ethical science. Determinism, or the denial of the freedom of the will, has, as a matter of historical fact, been usually associated with ethical hedonism. Results of rare importance for moral science follow from its acceptance and require careful consideration, all the more because they are so frequently denied. Stuart Mill was a determinist of a type, but strongly protested against his theory being regarded as in any sense fatalistic. He distinguished between 'Asiatic fatalism,' according to which all our actions are determined from without by some irresistible, relentless power, and 'Modified fatalism,' according to which our actions are predetermined by our character, and our character determined from without independently of our will. His own view differs in important respects from both. It admits that our actions are determined by our character, but insists that our character can be modified by our will, which is itself determined in last analysis from without.² In this way Mill attempted to justify upon deterministic principles a theory of punishment—punishment being lawful as furnishing a motive to the will for future good conduct. So, too, he conceived that in this manner he had found a place within

¹ *Methods of Ethics*, Bk. i. chap. v.

² *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy*, ch. xxvi.

a system of rigid determinism for the possibility of moral progress and self-culture.

Sidgwick's view is closely allied to this, exhibiting, however, a finer appreciation of the intricacy of the question, and discarding altogether Mill's direct psychological attack upon free-will. Sidgwick regards the cumulative argument in favour of determinism as very strong, if not overwhelming, and although with his usual caution he refuses to decide the free-will controversy, still he insists that its decision is of no weight as far as ethics is concerned:—

In the conflict of arguments, it is not surprising that the theoretical question as to the Freedom of the Will is still differently decided by thinkers of repute; and I do not myself wish to pronounce any decision on it. But I think it possible and useful to show that the ethical importance of deciding it one way or another is liable to be exaggerated; and that anyone who will consider the matter soberly and carefully will find this importance to be of a strictly limited kind.¹

Now this is the very heart of the difficulty. If I am not in some sense free, what possible meaning can be given to the statement that it is *my duty* to select a certain line of action, that I *ought* so to act, that I am responsible for the line of conduct I finally select? Sidgwick maintains that on the deterministic theory quite a definite meaning can be given to these statements. Certainly it would be strange if no change should occur for morality when the freedom of the will is finally abandoned as untenable. How can I be responsible for conduct which is not in any sense attributable to my free selection? What meaning can be given to such ethical notions as 'merit,' 'demerit,' 'remorse,' and 'punishment'? It is interesting to notice the extent of Sidgwick's admissions respecting these points:—

For it must be admitted, I think, that the common retributive view of punishment, and the ordinary notions of 'merit,' 'demerit,' and 'responsibility,' also involve the assumption of Free Will: if the wrong act and the bad qualities of character

¹ *Methods of Ethics*, p. 66.

manifested in it, are conceived as the necessary effects of causes antecedent or external to the existence of the agent, the moral responsibility—in the ordinary sense—for the mischief caused by them can no longer rest on him. At the same time, the Determinist can give to the terms ‘ill-desert’ and ‘responsibility’ a signification which is not only clear and definite, but, from a utilitarian point of view, the only suitable meaning.¹

Here all we require for our present purpose is conceded, namely, that an important change is introduced into the meaning of our ethical conceptions by the adoption of determinism. And it is clear that Sidgwick tends to be a determinist rather than a libertarian. His method of meeting the well-known Kantian argument that ‘what I ought to do I can do’ is of interest, though it carries us, I fear, very far afield:—

As regards action generally, the Determinist allows that a man is only morally bound to do ‘what is in his power’; but he explains ‘in his power’ to mean that the result in question will be produced if the man choose to produce it. And this is, I think, the sense in which the proposition ‘what I ought to do I can do’ is commonly accepted: it means ‘*can do if I choose,*’ not ‘*can choose to do.*’ Still the question remains ‘*Can I choose to do what in ordinary thought I judge to be right to do?*’ Here my own view is that—within the limits above explained—I inevitably conceive that I *can* choose.²

A similar line of thought is traceable in Mill’s treatment of the question in the *Examination*. It is a clever attempt to shift the centre of gravity of the question—to substitute for the present certainty of a power of selection the present uncertainty of a future choice. But it scarcely touches the real difficulty, and is in no way helpful in avoiding moral fatalism. It rests the little power it seems to give us upon our ignorance of the future. The illusion of choice comes from defective foresight. Again, I scarcely mean ‘Can do if I choose’ for ‘if I should not choose,’ I would still maintain that I could have chosen. Hence the question becomes, am I justified in supposing that I could have

¹ *Methods of Ethics*, p. 71.

² *Ibid.* p. 67.

chosen? Ultimately this method of dealing with the question pushes it further back. It denies freedom at one point by presupposing it at another. (The fallacy also involved in the deterministic attempt to justify self-culture.) The determinist may say that a man is only bound to do what is 'in his power,' meaning that the act will be produced if the man choose to produce it. But his choice itself, which then becomes the important moment, is inevitably conditioned. He has really no power of self-initiative, but is purely a resultant of forces. Should his choice happen to lie this way he will act so, not otherwise. Nothing can extricate us from this logical *impasse*.

It is not here my purpose to offer any solution of the free-will controversy, but rather to trace the implications of Sidgwick's thought upon the question. This cannot easily be fixed—it is to some extent (as indeed speculations upon this problem are apt to be) elusive and evanescent. But he certainly does definitely maintain, following Mill, that determinism as a rigid system is quite compatible with the possibility of moral improvement or self-culture, even if it involves some change in the meaning of obligation, responsibility, and remorse. This is a point of some interest. If my actions are in every case the result of my character and circumstances, how is moral improvement possible? It is idle to contend that the line of action I now *adopt* will, on deterministic principles, affect my future conduct, and so by now *selecting* the moral course I can improve myself for the future. Certainly all this is true. But if it is a sufficient basis for moral improvement, the theory is not extravagant in its logical requirements. This delightfully convenient style of reasoning consists in a transference of the nerve of the difficulty to a previous choice. 'And here the problem breaks out afresh,' as Mr. Bradley would say. In what precise sense can I be said to *adopt* or *select* the present line of conduct that is to so influence my action in the future? I cannot be said to be capable of improving my moral condition unless I have at some point the power of self-initiative. We need something to grip on to, some point of support, or the whole business becomes unintelligible, resembling

somewhat the fabled trick of the Indian juggler, who casts up his rope into the air and then climbs up it into the super-celestial void. If my actions from the beginning are rigidly determined, then in the course of time, by various collocations of circumstances, I may become better, but this is no more moral self-culture or self-improvement than the unfolding of a bud into blossom or the development of a blossom into the ripened fruit.

Sidgwick with rare penetration points out the destructive effects upon our moral nature which determinism, if held with a living force of conviction, may exert. If I definitely foresee or seem to foresee that such and such a direction of choice in the future will not be possible to me, morally constructed as I am, I cannot direct my will towards it with any really active energy. But he acutely observes that such definite foresight is seldom possible, and perhaps never quite of sufficient logical strength to justify my moral despair. The present fleeting moment of life is never a clear mountain summit from which we serenely view the perspective of our future life. We have no claim to the splendidly illuminative metaphor that St. Thomas applies to the foresight of the Deity: 'Deus est in arce aeternitatis.' So far Sidgwick shows true discrimination. But he overlooks that mere subtly working moral scepticism that arises from the conviction that at no point of my career have I a genuine power of self-determination, the capacity, in a true sense and not merely as a pretence, to be 'faber fortunae.' He underestimates the force of that determinism which has thoroughly realized itself, and which must inevitably become conscious that

'the first morning of creation wrote,
What the last dawn of reckoning shall read.'

We pass to the problem of the absolute character of ordinary moral principles. Here Sidgwick adopts what he himself calls 'a complex and balanced' position. To sum up his attitude in a phrase—the morality of common sense (so he terms ordinary moral rules and principles) is simply 'a machinery of rules, habits, and sentiments roughly and

generally but not precisely or completely adapted to the production of the greatest possible happiness for sentient beings generally.’¹ The rules of our common morality are simply generalized laws, *axiomata media*, embodying the experience of the race as to the best ways of promoting the general happiness. Our ancestors (and it is a pleasure to be able to say a good word for their unconscious acuteness in this matter, they have been so degraded by recent speculations) have somehow hit upon the best way of promoting the general happiness, an object they were never particularly interested in. It was not part of Sidgwick’s purpose to deny the transcendent value of these moral principles. On the contrary, convinced as he was of the utter unworkableness of the hedonistic criterion of pleasure—for who could hope to work out even the simplest hedonic sum, or calculate the results in the way of pleasure or pain that follow from any human action—he ‘remained anxious to treat with respect, and make use of the guidance afforded by Common Sense in these cases, on the ground of the general presumption which evolution afforded that moral sentiments and opinions would point to conduct conducive to general happiness.’² We here see the inevitable tendency of theories that deny moral intuitions to work their way back to them by a circuitous route.

The Utilitarian [Sidgwick tells us] must repudiate altogether that temper of rebellion against the established morality, as something purely external and conventional, into which the reflective mind is always apt to fall when it is first convinced that the established rules are not intrinsically reasonable. He must, of course, also repudiate as superstitious that awe of it as an absolute or Divine Code which Intuitionist moralists inculcate. Still, he will naturally contemplate it with reverence and wonder, as a marvellous product of nature, the result of long centuries of growth, showing in many parts the same fine adaptation of means to complex exigencies as the most elaborate structures of physical organisms exhibit.³

¹ *Henry Sidgwick : A Memoir*, p. 473.

² *Methods of Ethics*, 6th ed. p. xxi.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 473, 447.

Surely ethics has travelled a long way even from the position of Kant, who, looking upon the heavens without and the moral law within, found them both sublime. It requires no great logical penetration to notice the important change that hedonism (combined here with evolutionism) introduces into our view of the moral law. It is no longer a law of absolute authority ; it is in fact extremely defective in many points, however admirable in general structure ; a growth, a development, subject to change, and requiring, at least occasionally, correction and revision. 'As this actual moral order is admittedly imperfect, it will be the utilitarian's duty to aid in improving it.'¹ Sidgwick's attitude is summed up in a letter to Roden Noel in 1871 :—

You see though I hold strongly that the Right is knowable, if not 'absolutely' (in your sense), yet as an ideal, a standard to which we may indefinitely approximate, I by no means assert that it is *known*, that our general rules are even nearly the best possible. And I think it probable that the current morality is faulty just in the direction you indicate, by having too general rigid rules, and not making allowance enough for individual differences. At the same time I do think the broad lines of right conduct are pretty well ascertained.²

In a personal utterance like this we catch the spirit of his thought—its sincerity, its firm grasp of logical issues, its supreme caution in definitely stating results. And the whole cast of his mind helps to convince us that the opinion of the absolutely binding nature of common moral rules will not unite with a utilitarian criterion of morals. We feel that he has retained as much as the logic of the situation warrants. Elsewhere³ Sidgwick marks out the exact extent to which interference with the moral code on the part of the enlightened utilitarian is advisable or allowable. And he brings forward admirable reasons why it would, generally speaking, be inadvisable to alter established moral laws. This, however, is a side issue, an appeal for moderation in the working of moral scepticism. Incidentally,

¹ *Methods of Ethics*, 6th ed., p. 446.

² *Henry Sidgwick : A Memoir*, p. 243.

³ *Methods of Ethics*, Bk. iv. chap. v.

however, it brings to light the curious fact that from the moral standpoint of a convinced utilitarian, the worst thing that could happen for morality generally would be a diffusion of the knowledge of what it really is. What if the bewildering uncertainty as to whether morality is in any sense capable of rational explanation, were also to become generally known! And if true, could there be any permanent hope that this knowledge could be withheld? Surely it is a startling paradox that the highest duty for those who are so unfortunate as to be initiated into the secret nature of morality is to carefully conceal this knowledge from the rest of mankind. Where the world is thoroughly bad (to adapt a well-known aphorism of Mr. Bradley) it may, perhaps, be some comfort not to know the worst.

This seems, then, the final issue of Sidgwick's theory of our moral life. He writes in his diary, April 14, 1887:—

I find myself without impulse to write anything of my inner life in this journal; the fact is that while I find it easy enough to *live* with more or less satisfaction, I cannot at present get any satisfaction from *thinking* about life, for thinking means—as I am a philosopher—endeavouring to frame an ethical theory which will hold together, and to this I do not see my way. And the consideration that the morality of the world may be trusted to get on without philosophers does not altogether console. The ancient sage took up a strong position who argued, 'We must philosophize, for either we ought to philosophize or we ought not; and if we ought not to philosophize, we can only know this by studying philosophy.' But tradition does not say what course the sage recommended to a philosopher who has philosophized himself into a conviction of the unprofitableness of philosophy.¹

In the same diary, April 14, 1886, we read the interesting entry: 'Read Gass's *Christliche Ethik*, and wondered in what age of the world I should have had most chance of being a Christian; decided in favour of the thirteenth century—supposing I could have been a pupil of Thomas Aquinas.'²

¹ Henry Sidgwick: *A Memoir*, p. 475.

² *Ibid.* p. 446.

To the student of ethical tendencies it cannot but be clear that the two-fold problem towards which ethical interest is converging, and upon which in the future its energies will inevitably be concentrated, is much more prominent in the works of Sidgwick than in those of Mill. Sidgwick's strength lay in his power of masterly criticism. He loosened the strands of theory that had been woven together in the system of Mill. He thought out to a definite issue all that a rational theory of utilitarianism would presuppose, the minimum of belief upon which as a basis it could logically be constructed. He found that he could not himself accept with any compelling certitude these necessary postulates of Ethics—and so he left the question unanswered. Perhaps it is not too much to say that Sidgwick has left no room for any future worker in the same field. He has finally demonstrated that a purely mundane ethics of the hedonistic type is logically impossible. One cannot but sympathize with his eager struggle towards the truth, his deep and earnest conviction of the abiding value for human life and human effort of beliefs and principles that he could not share—his contempt for any evasion of these great issues as unimportant or trivial. 'I feel by the limitations of my nature,' he writes, 'incapable of really comprehending the state of mind of one who does not *desire* the continuance of his personal being.'¹ He never lost sight of the momentous character of the issues involved, and perhaps upon the whole inclined to the positive side :—

I cannot resign myself to disbelief in duty ; in fact if I did I should feel that the last barrier between me and complete philosophical scepticism, or disbelief in truth altogether, was broken down. Therefore, I sometimes say to myself, 'I believe in God,' while sometimes again I can say no more than : 'I hope this belief is true, and I must and will act as if it was.'²

D. O'KEEFFE.

[*To be continued.*]

¹ *Henry Sidgwick : A Memoir*, p. 471.

² *Ibid.* pp. 437, 438.

THE NEW 'ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA'
AND THE MONASTIC TRADITIONS OF
THE CARMELITES

HAVING been assured, in the 'Prospectus,' that 'the whole world of scholarship was ready to lend a hand in the perfecting of the work, bringing special knowledge to bear in the shape of editorial assistance, as well as in the contribution of the articles,'¹ I was much surprised to find the following expression of opinion in a notice on the Carmelites which appears in the new edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*: 'The stories concerning the origin of this Order, seriously put forward and believed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, are one of the curiosities of history.'²

Within recent years these religious have grown accustomed to such references to the origin of their Order, and have even been reproached for their silence while their revered monastic traditions were thus deliberately assailed. But we, Carmelites, could have done nothing beyond convicting our critics of ignorance of the only recognized sources of authentic information regarding the basis of our history; and we still shrink from the profitless, if not embittered, controversies to which exposure of this kind almost invariably leads. Hence, in the present instance, I myself should not have paid the slightest attention to the disparaging passage just quoted but for an official intimation that this was considered a case calling for formal protest on behalf of the Order, seeing that the writer of the article in question is a Catholic priest and a religious, and that he mentions 'a Carmelite friar' as one of his principal authorities.³

¹ 'Prospectus,' p. 26.

² Vol. v. p. 358 (11th edition, Cambridge University Press, 1910).

³ 'The observations and comments made by the reverend editor of the *Monumenta Historica Carmelitana* are far from meriting the approval of those interested in the history of the Order of Mount Carmel; because

In these circumstances any formal protest ought, I think, to partake rather of the nature of a critical exposition of the sources which contain all essential facts relating to the origin and progress of the Order down to the year 1247, the date of the final confirmation of the abridged Carmelite Rule. Such a course seems all the more necessary because of the confusion sure to arise in the minds of those consulting that article in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica*, wherein certain legends and pious surmises—for which the medieval friars were not always responsible—have manifestly been mistaken for monastic traditions: otherwise the claims of the Carmelites would never have been characterized, by a Catholic writer, as ‘stories’ originating in the ‘seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.’ However, in undertaking this task I shall mainly confine myself to ancient documents and codices the authenticity of which has never yet been seriously impugned.¹ They will not include the ‘MS. Collections’ of John Bale; for the latest of the codices to which I shall have occasion to refer bears the date A.D. 1477, almost twenty years before the birth of that unhappy apostate.²

Nevertheless, Bale’s unpublished writings—to all of which I have had, of course, free access, and have now by me useful summaries of the same—mark the extreme limit of the research of those modern critics who have failed to grasp the vitally important bearing of the Carmelite traditions from the strictly historical point of view. In fact, even the best known of Bale’s edited works³ might have afforded a careful reader this clue; and in the case of the contributor to the new *Encyclopædia Britannica* would certainly have suggested as particularly opportune some

of the same remarks being opposed in many respects to the most solidly founded traditions of the Order.’

NOTE.—We have been requested to state that Father Rushe’s article is published with the express sanction of the Superior-General of the Discalced Carmelites.—ED., I. E. RECORD.

¹ Least of all by modern writers.

² I may remark, in passing, that even after his apostasy Bale still highly appreciated the value of these sources to the historian. His MSS. are preserved partly in the British Museum, partly at Oxford (Bodleian Library), and partly at University Library, Cambridge.

³ *Scriptores Britannicæ*, cent. vi. p. 480.

allusion to a famous medieval controversy in connexion with the fact of this work of reference having 'found a natural abiding place in coming under the control of the University of Cambridge.'¹ Then, at all events, there could have been no danger of readers misunderstanding in what sense the monastic traditions of the Order were accepted as early as the year of our Lord 1374.

At that epoch considerable jealousy of the White Friars existed in the English Universities. This found expression in sceptical comment on the claims upon which the Carmelites had insisted from their first appearance at those centres of learning during the course of the preceding century, although it was already well known that in the meantime one of these claims had been strikingly confirmed by supernatural intervention—a fact, I may remark, never questioned until the White Friars were attacked later on by the Wyclifites.² Still, the criticism indulged in was so disedifying as to threaten a scandal among the laity; so one of the senior Carmelite professors at Cambridge appealed, on behalf of his Order, to the Chancellor for permission to invite hostile critics to make good their position, according to the custom of the schools, in presence of the authorities of the University. For his own part, he undertook to submit the positive evidence upon which the Carmelites based their claims; and in a lengthy historical disquisition he demonstrated, to the perfect satisfaction of a specially-constituted impartial tribunal, that he and his brethren in religion had absolutely no option but to uphold those questions of well-established fact, not one of which their opponents could venture to deny, now that they were constrained to respect the canons of scientific criticism.

¹ 'Prospectus,' p. 4.

² This, I need hardly say, is in allusion to the vision vouchsafed to St. Simon Stock, and associated with Our Lady's promise attaching to the Brown Scapular of the Order. The scope of the present paper does not admit of a digression on this subject, but, with the editor's permission, I should gladly avail myself of another occasion to submit a critical review of the medieval MS. materials, still extant, from which the authentic history of the 'Scapular Promise' is drawn. They have not yet been so much as mentioned in *any* contribution appearing in the I. E. RECORD. I have especially before my mind the articles published in the course of the year 1904.

The Chancellor—whose name, ‘Master John Donewych,’ still holds a prominent place in Cambridge’s roll of honour¹—announced the decision of the judges by issuing two decrees entirely in favour of the White Friars, and imposing silence, under severe statutory penalties, upon their adversaries. I feel justified in quoting the following passage from the shorter of these interesting documents, as it reveals, in concise and accurate form, the nature of the claims then allowed to the Carmelites in virtue of their monastic traditions:—

. . . Nos Joannes de Donewico Cancellarius Universitatis Cantabrigiae, auditis rationibus, et allegationibus, visisque privilegiis, lectis, et examinatis, una cum Chronicis, et scripturis antiquis Ordinem Fratrum Beatae Mariae de Monte Carmeli in jure communi, ac speciali confirmatum, tituloque Gloriosae Virginis Beatae Mariae Dei Genitrici specialiter fore insignitum, ac Fratres dicti Ordinis, prout nobis apparuit per Chronicas, et alias scripturas antiquas, Imitatores, et Successores esse Sanctorum Prophetarum Eliae, ac Elisaei; pronunciamus, decernimus, et declaramus: De quibus vero declaratione, decreto, et pronunciatione, idem Dominus Cancellarius, et saepe dictus Frater Joannes de Horneby, rogaverunt me [Joannem de Brandoeferie, Clericum, etc.] publicum conficere Instrumentum. . . .²

From which it is quite evident that the question concerning the origin of the Carmelites was taken very seriously, indeed, at a much earlier epoch than that which the casual reader is led to infer from the article in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Nor was belief in the ancient traditions of this Order by any means peculiar to the White Friars themselves, for here we have a learned Carmelite professor of Cambridge, named John de Horneby, in a position to convince other equally learned men—not his brethren in religion—of the authenticity of certain claims, which had been disputed by others, to whom, no doubt, the University likewise owes a share of its medieval fame. I may add that one of the decrees mentioned demonstrates the impartiality of

¹ See ‘Register of Clare College’ (*Hist. MSS. Comm. Report*, ii. p. 111).

² MS. Ff. 6. 11, p. 46 sqq., University Library, Cambridge. An authenticated copy of this decree was published at Venice in the year 1507. (See the ‘Speculum Ordinis,’ ff. 80, 81, T.C.D. Lib. DD.d.)

the tribunal elected to decide the issue; and, as we have just seen, it was in virtue of the positive evidence submitted to the same that de Horneby won his cause.

But it will at once occur to the critical reader to ask: How much of that evidence, fairly easy of access, perhaps, in the fourteenth century, could be produced before a similarly constituted tribunal for scientific examination at the present day? First of all, we have the historians of Cambridge University deploring the loss of 'the charters, ordinances, and other evidences,' taken away by the 'mad rabble and publicly burnt in a riot of the year, 1381.'¹ Then comes John Bale's own bitter outcry at the vandalism of a later age (A.D. 1549), in the wanton destruction of the monastic libraries:—

. . . But to destroye all without consyderacyon, is and wyll be vnto Englande for euer, a moste horryble infamy amonge the graue senyours of other nacyons. . . . Yea, the vnyuersytees of thys realme, are not all clere in thys detestable fact. . . . I knowe a merchaunt man that boughte the contentes of two noble lybraryes for xl. shyllynges pryce, a shame it is to be spoken. Thys stuffe hath he occupyed in the stede of graye paper by the space of more than these x. yeares, and yet he hath store ynough for as many yeares to come.²

Yet, it is possible to indicate not only where the reader may consult authentic drafts of the two 'Cambridge decrees,' and even a contemporary copy of de Horneby's historical disquisition,³ but also several still more ancient codices containing authoritative narratives concerning the origin of the Carmelite Order. These narratives, four in number, were edited in one volume prior (A.D. 1370) to the Cambridge controversy, and for an object totally different from that which de Horneby had in view, thus—to my mind—further enhancing the evidential value of the ancient MSS. to which I allude. Moreover, they are given a first place in the lengthy list of *Opera pro conficiendis cronicis*

¹ Cooper's *Annals*, i. p. 121. Also Masters' *History of the College of Corpus Christi*, p. 32.

² Leland's *New Year's Gift* ('Priory Press' Edition, 1895, p. 18).

³ Preserved at Oxford, MS. Bodley, e Mus. 86.

Carmelitarum compiled by John Bale, whose authority, strange to say, appeals most forcibly to modern hostile critics of the Carmelites.¹ Even a passing glance at this same list will show conclusively that it is Bale, not the Carmelite annalists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, who should be held responsible for certain 'stories' which the contributor to the new *Encyclopædia Britannica* would probably include among the monastic traditions of the Order.

The issue so concisely defined by John de Donewico admits of no misgiving as to what the claims of the Carmelites imply, but I shall endeavour to express it more clearly, if possible, in order that the reader may realize how vitally the question affects these religious to-day; in fact, remembering a recent Papal admonition as to the importance of upholding the integrity of monastic tradition in the Church, I might urge that this phase of the subject concerns all religious institutions, bearing especially on the renowned Order to which the writer in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica* has the honour to belong.² Therefore, on behalf of my own Order, I now state most emphatically that we continue to accept and maintain what our predecessors of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were authorized to 'put forward and believe,' and of the historical truth of which John de Horneby was himself so thoroughly convinced that he had, apparently, but little difficulty in persuading his opponents of their uncritical attitude, on being appointed to do so before an impartial tribunal at Cambridge. And, I repeat, the sole object of this protest is to remove any false impressions that may be occasioned by the personal opinion of yet another of those writers whose vague knowledge of the origin of the Carmelites has been derived from sources upon which no critical student of the history of this Order would ever have relied.

Put even still more succinctly, the *fundamental* tradition

¹ MS. Bodley 73, f. 156.

² For the letter of His Holiness Pope Pius X. on this subject, see the *Analecta Ecclesiastica* for November, 1908, vol. xvi. p. 436.

of the Carmelites is their mode of life, inaugurated by one who was the very first to inculcate a system of asceticism whereby God-fearing men might best insure their personal sanctification. It may be argued that the essential principles upon which this system is based are, likewise, to be found underlying each and every other form of monastic life sanctioned by the Church. However, before indulging in ludicrous insinuations, hostile critics of the White Friars should have informed themselves of St. Jerome's 'views' on this subject.¹ Besides, it should be known that no one has so insisted upon the incidental prestige accruing to the Carmelites in this connexion as a learned Benedictine writer of the fifteenth century, the celebrated Abbot Trithemius.²

This vital tradition of the Order necessarily includes a three-fold claim: attributing the origin of the Carmelites to the Prophet Elias; upholding hereditary and uninterrupted succession from him as their veritable founder; and insisting upon a specially privileged title, that dates back to the very inauguration of this Institute, and which from time immemorial actually enters into the formulary of profession used by these religious when taking the monastic vows. One of the 'authorities' quoted in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica* asserts, 'It was in this extreme form that the Carmelite view of the antiquity of their Order was combated in the seventeenth century.' But that writer also manifests amazing ignorance as to the fact of the much criticized word 'hereditary' having been the term employed by Pope Sixtus IV. in confirming the privileges granted to the Order by his predecessors, and this for a grave reason which that Pontiff himself

¹ 'Ep. ad Paulinum lviii.' (Migne Ed. p. 583). Also 'Ep. lxxvi.' But later on I shall have something to add concerning the testimony furnished by the writings of the Fathers.

² '*Joannis Trithemii, Abbatis Spanheimensis, Ordinis S. Benedicti Liber: De ortu, et progressu, ac laudibus Ordinis gloriosissimæ Dei Genitricis semperque Virginis Mariæ de monte Carmelo*' (Antverpiæ, . . . anno MDCLXXX.). A quotation from this treatise may not be admissible here, but it is significant that Trithemius deems it sufficient just to mention (cap. ii.) the four recognized sources of information—to which I am about to allude—to silence all adverse comment.

assigns.¹ Moreover, to these three primary claims must be added each and every fact recorded in that source of authentic information which treats of the traditionary phase of the Order: notably (because of its mystical significance) what is told us there of the origin of the White Mantle of the Carmelites.

It may prove interesting if I pause for a moment to test the critical value of the evidence submitted by John de Horneby on the occasion of the Cambridge controversy. He frequently alludes to the renowned Richard FitzRalph, Archbishop of Armagh, as one of—what modern writers would describe—his ‘independent witnesses.’² His chief reference is to a sermon preached by FitzRalph in the year 1342; and I am again so fortunate as to be in a position to inform the reader that contemporary copies of the ‘Collection’ containing this discourse are to be had in various public libraries.³ The importance therefore of this testimony is largely due to the reputation of one already widely acknowledged as the most learned, if keenest, critic of his age—one certainly not at all prejudiced in favour of the Carmelites. In fact, while defining their claims before an auditory far more illustrious than that assembled at Cambridge some thirty years later to criticize de Horneby’s protest, FitzRalph explained his motive for paying so striking a tribute to this Order—the authority of historians worthy of credence; and he expressly mentions one work as an unquestionable guarantee of the absolute accuracy of his statements. This was the book *On the Institution*

¹ *A Catholic Dictionary* (London, 1885), p. 120, is the ‘authority’ quoted in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Of course it is no more authoritative than the *Monumenta Historica Carmelitana*. As a Carmelite, naturally I should like to give an extract from the Bull of Pope Sixtus IV., *Dum attenta meditatione pensamus*; for I have by me the fine contemporary (A.D. 1477) copy of the *Mare Magnum* (the great collection of Privileges and Indulgences confirmed by this Pontiff), secured at the recent dispersion of the Phillipp MSS., but formerly belonging to the Carmelites of Chalons-sur-Saone (G. 12). The following words will suffice for my purpose: ‘. . . sanctorumque Prophetarum Eliae, et Elisei . . . successionem haereditariam tenentes’ (f. 4b). There are also MS. copies at Lambeth Palace, MS. 61; at the Bodleian (MS. Bibl. Canon.) 377; and at the British Museum, Royal MS. 10A. VI.

² MS. Bodley, e Mus. 86, *passim*.

³ T.C.D., MS. B. 4. 1, col. 5.

of the *First Monks*, written in the year 412 by the then Bishop of Jerusalem, more popularly known as the 'Patriarch John.'¹ The original text was in Greek, but it had been translated into Latin about the middle of the twelfth century in circumstances of exceptional interest, for which, however, I must refer the reader to the narrative of another Greek writer, St. Cyril of Constantinople, who joined the 'Hermits of Carmel' before the year 1185.²

This book was one of the four treatises newly edited (A.D. 1370) by a learned Carmelite of Catalonia named Philip Riboti. Consequently, FitzRalph must have had access to a much earlier version—perhaps to a contemporary copy of the first Latin translation, if not to the actual Greek text, since so erudite a scholar would, no doubt, be eager, like the Venerable Walden, to examine such a work in 'ancient writing.'³ St. Cyril's narrative is also included in the volume issued by Riboti, whose only purpose was to prepare a practical manual for the instruction and edification of his brethren in religion, thus placing at their disposal, in compact form, the authentic sources of information relating to the origin and progress of their Order. For which reason, likewise, he added the treatises by William de Sanvico and Sibert de Beka: that of the former containing an account of the expulsion of the religious from the East owing to the failure of the Crusades; that of the latter dealing with the final confirmation of the Carmelite Rule. De Sanvico flourished from A.D. 1254—just twenty years after the death of St. Cyril of Constantinople—passing most of his life in the 'Province of the Holy Land' (whence his

¹ Among the contemporary copies of FitzRalph's 'Sermons' is the MS. preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, B. 4. 1, col. 5. This press-marking indicates that it belongs to Archbishop Ussher's collection—'purchased for Trinity College . . . by the officers and soldiers of Cromwell's army in Ireland' (*The Book of Trinity College*, p. 149). It is the celebrated 'Armachanus'—not any of the medieval White Friars—who expresses himself in the following words: ' . . . merito gaudent [Carmelitæ] prae caeteris Ordinibus antiquitatis honore' (l.c.)

² This date is sufficiently definite for the present; for I have not yet been able to verify the year assigned by John Bale (MS. Selden, Oxford, *supra* 41, 12).

³ MS. Bodley, 73, f. 99. (Also one of Bale's 'Collections.')

surname);¹ and seeing that Sibert de Beka survived until the year 1330, this distinguished man may be regarded as the coeval of Philip Riboti. But it must not be thought that the Carmelites generally had hitherto been left unprovided for in the all-important matter of official information about the origin of their Order. The year before Richard FitzRalph's name first appears as 'Fellow of Baliol College, Oxford,'² the General Chapter of the White Friars was held at Barcelona (A.D. 1324). A copy of the 'Constitutions' then approved—written in a clear hand of the period—is preserved among the MSS. at the British Museum. Portion of the first Rubric reads as follows, and should prove interesting for comparison with the extract quoted above from the Cambridge decree:—

Cum quidem fratres in Ordine nostro juniores quaerentibus a quo, quando vel quomodo Ordo noster sumpserit exordium, vel quare dicamur Fratres Ordinis Beatæ Mariæ de Monte Carmeli, juxta rei veritatem nesciant satisfacere, pro eis inscriptis formam talibus relinquentes volumus respondere: Dicimus autem veritati testimonium perhibentes, quod a tempore Eliæ et Elisei Prophetarum montem Carmeli devote inhabitantium, Sancti Patres tam novi quam veteris Testamenti ejusdem montis solitudinis pro contemplatione coelestium veri amatores, ibidem juxta fontem Eliæ in sancta poenitentia, sanctis successibus, incessanter continuata sunt proculdubio laudabiliter conversati. Quorum successores post Incarnationem Christi ibidem ecclesiam in honore Beatæ Mariæ Virginis construxerunt, et Ipsius titulum elegerunt, et ob hoc deinceps Fratres Beatæ Mariæ de Monte Carmeli per apostolica privilegia sunt vocati.³

¹ In the volume to which special attention is drawn in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica* it is asserted (p. 211): 'Gulielmus natione Anglus erat ex Sanvico in littore meridionali Angliæ oriundus, non Syrus ut quidam volunt.' I should not be disposed to take a serious view of this fantastical conjecture were it not that elsewhere in the same volume (p. 343) 'Magis tamen me movet silentium auctorum' is urged as an *argumentum ad hominem* in matters of the gravest importance. So I may allude to John Bale's remarkable silence concerning the existence of 'William of Sandwich' when treating of the English Carmelite writers (MS. Harley 3838, lib. ii.), although he refers (MS. Bodley 73, l.c.) to the narrative of William 'de Sanvico' quite frequently, indeed.

² *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, iv. p. 442.

³ Add. MSS. 16372. Only the first page (f. 1) is slightly faded. N.B.—Similar codices are to be found in different public libraries abroad, such as those at Nantes (MS. 89), Lunel (MS. 15), and No. 1791 of the Mazarin MSS. (Paris).

The writer in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica* had admittedly an opportunity of examining this Rubric, and of noticing the critical precision with which certain historical facts are distinguished from the ancient traditions of the Order. He cannot have done so; for whether of tradition or of history he has characterized the claims of the Carmelites as 'stories' invented (presumably) 'in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.' Nor would he have grasped the full bearing of that distinction unless he knew in which chapter of the book *On the Institution of the First Monks* John of Jerusalem speaks of the privileged title of these religious as being traditionary in their Order, and in which he records the building of the chapel on Mount Carmel, thus fixing the date (A.D. 83) of the formal recognition of this same title in the Eastern Church.¹ Canonical sanction followed at a somewhat later period; and here we have Richard FitzRalph quoting other 'independent witnesses' in confirmation of an historical fact which he assigns to the year 431.²

But FitzRalph's 'Master in the Schools,' the famous John Baconthorpe, was Provincial of the English White Friars from the year 1329; yet we find him alluding to that selfsame Rubric as occurring in the 'Ancient Constitutions' of his Order!³ As I have already indicated, quite a number of copies of the medieval Constitutions may still be examined by the student of Carmelite history, if anxious to acquire 'special knowledge' of his subject; but none of those which have come under my own notice date so far back as to suggest the great age that Baconthorpe's remark leads us to infer. Copies of the 'Ancient Ordinal,' or Ritual, of the Carmelites written about the middle of the preceding century (say the year 1247, the date of the final

¹ *Liber de Institutione Primorum Monachorum in Lege Veteri Exortorum et in Nova Perseverantium*, cap. xliii. I shall give references to the Riboti version further on, when alluding to the medieval copies to which I have had access.

² John de Horneby attaches much importance to this testimony of Arnachanus; but in one of his sermons, only a fragment of which now remains (MS. Bodley, e Mus. 86, f. 211b).

³ 'In prima [igitur?] insuper Constitutione dicti Ordinis, edita ab antiquo, invenitur' (as above, MS. Laud. (Oxford) Misc. 722, f. 123).

confirmation of the Rule sometimes found prefixed to the same) are now extant; ¹ still, I do not think either Baconthorpe or any of his contemporaries would have considered codices 'ancient' that were not at least a couple of hundred years old. In saying this I am adopting the opinion of those later annalists who maintain that the 'Resolute Doctor'—Baconthorpe's title in the medieval schools—referred to the Statutes compiled during the life of St. Berthold, at whose request the book of the Patriarch John was translated from the Greek. Not alone does Baconthorpe insist upon the evidential value of this Rubric from the historical standpoint; he shows aptly that it would prove just as forcible if submitted to the test of Canon Law; since 'Monachi possint testificari in causa sui monasterii. . . . Quia illi potissimum in testes sunt assumendi, qui eadem negotia tractaverunt.'²

It is hardly necessary to remark that Baconthorpe and all the other celebrated Carmelite Doctors of the Middle Ages were well aware of the supreme significance of the Rubric being due to the fact of its having come directly from the book *On the Institution of the First Monks*, with the alteration of scarcely a word down to the reference to the Albertine Rule. In the summary of the same contained in the Constitutions of the Discalced Carmelites appropriate mention is made of St. Teresa's zeal for the monastic traditions of her Order.³

Indeed, if I am not grievously mistaken, it was Baconthorpe's practical appreciation of the sublime doctrine expounded by John of Jerusalem that inspired him to conceive his own beautiful interpretation of the 'Primitive Carmelite Rule.'⁴ Those familiar with the contents of Riboti's volume will better understand what I mean, and can realize how the wondrous writings of St. Teresa herself

¹ T.C.D., MS. B. 3. 8. This is an extremely important MS.

² MS. Laud. Misc. 722, l.c.

³ 'Quam vitæ rationem ex Dei et proximorum amore compositum, Patres Nostri Elias et Eliseus, non scripto, sed rebus gestis instituerunt, et posteris observandam tradiderunt.' This is how the fundamental tradition of the Order is expressed in the latest edition of the Constitutions of the Discalced Carmelites (Romæ, MCMVI. p. 14).

⁴ 'Tractatus de Regula,' MS. Laud. Misc. 722, f. 121b.

and of St. John of the Cross might be quoted to instance the prevailing influence of the selfsame source of inspiration. When editing the treatise Philip Riboti utilized his wide knowledge of the works of the Fathers of the Church, Greek and Latin, to illustrate various passages in the ascetical teaching of the holy Patriarch; and, furthermore, he institutes a critical comparison between this book and the very brief Rule compiled by Blessed Albert for the 'Hermits of Carmel,' at the special request of St. Brocard, the second Latin Prior-General of the Order. He sums up the result of his investigation in a proposition which he afterwards clearly demonstrates: 'Quod nulla, aut pauca, Albertus in praedicta Regula inseruerit, quae Joannes prius in Institutione hujus Religionis non habebat; sed quae Joannes in generali suadendo scripserat, Albertus in Regula in speciali determinat.'¹

Riboti speaks of the Carmelite Rule as confirmed by Pope Innocent IV. in the year 1247, after a Papal Commission had suggested certain modifications in the original draft prepared by Blessed Albert, Patriarch of Jerusalem (A.D. 1205-1210). And Sibert de Beka explains how these modifications were introduced to bring some of the ordinances into stricter conformity with the ascetical teaching of the Patriarch John.²

Possibly the writer in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica* would resent the imputation of having questioned the canonical integrity of this Rule, his sweeping rejection of the monastic traditions of the Carmelites being solely directed to 'the stories concerning the origin of this Order, seriously put forward and believed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.' But, I repeat, there are *no* 'stories' or legends relating to our origin; and those who rashly assert the contrary are, in reality, endeavouring to retard the cause of historical truth. In other circumstances their attitude might not be so leniently interpreted, if we declined to accept the plea of ignorance of the nature of the *facts*

¹ For the moment I must refer to the Lambeth MS., No. 192, Latin text, lib. viii. cap. iv.

² Ibid. cap. vi.

recorded by John of Jerusalem, since knowledge would argue a most reprehensible trifling with the sacred sources whence the holy Patriarch's information has been chiefly drawn.¹ As for those 'pious surmises' attributed to the Carmelites, but for which such critical 'independent witnesses' as Richard FitzRalph are responsible, they should never have been confused with the vital issues at stake. Writing in the year 412, it is quite true that the Patriarch John relates as *historical facts* the conversion of the 'Hermits of Carmel' to Christianity, and the subsequent building of a church in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary.² Alluding to the latter event, it is equally certain that FitzRalph has gone beyond his text by assuming that the actual site of this church was 'in loco, forsan, in quo didicerant Ipsam in vita sua cum sodalibus virginibus cohabitasse.'³ But it would be a grotesque perversion of this suggestion to insinuate (and on whose authority?) that the Carmelites of the 'seventeenth and eighteenth centuries . . . seriously put forward and believed' that our Lady 'as well as the Apostles enrolled herself in the Order.'⁴

There was not the slightest danger of the pious surmise being misunderstood by any of the learned men who listened to that memorable sermon; for they knew that FitzRalph merely wished to bring home to them all the more forcibly the intimate association of the grand prerogative of the Immaculate Conception with an ancient tradition of the Carmelites, dating back to the days of the Prophet Elias; and for this they had the authority of the Patriarch John.⁵ It was accepted in the same spirit by Thomas Walden, who thus acknowledges the tribute paid to his Order by the

¹ In fact, one of the reasons why the book *On the Institution of the First Monks* was so earnestly recommended to the religious by Riboti and many other medieval writers of the Order will explain the above remark: it served as a lucid commentary on certain portions of the Holy Scriptures.

² Chapter xliii. Lambeth MS. 192, lib. x. cap. v. St. Cyril draws particular attention to the positive evidence utilized by the Patriarch John, as we shall see presently.

³ T.C.D. MS. B. 4. 1, l.c.

⁴ I feel quite sure that the writer in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica* is not responsible for any such perversion of the words used by Richard FitzRalph; but he does not quote his authority for the 'story' mentioned.

⁵ Chapter xxxix. Lambeth MS. 192, lib. vi. cap. i.

great 'Armachanus': '. . . Tacent Carmelitae, dum talis et tantus testis magnus indubie praesul Ecclesiae, et vir altae peritiae in sacris litteris, testimonium perhibeat.'¹ Like FitzRalph himself, Walden could appreciate the historical importance of the book *On the Institution of the First Monks* ('qui liber,' he writes, 'magni pretii et honoris esset apud nos'); and it seems he was most anxious to secure for the English Province a copy of the first Latin version of the work—else the original Greek text: 'maxime si emi posset ut haberetur in vetusta scriptura.'²

Furthermore, we actually find one of the medieval Carmelite Doctors—Thomas Bradley, afterwards Bishop of Dromore in Ireland—complaining of the fact of a certain popular but unfounded legend having arisen owing to the neglect of the official sources of information concerning the origin of the White Mantle. He was aware that the authority of some of the most celebrated members of the Order appeared to favour the plausibleness of this legend; but Bradley maintained that this would not justify the critical student of Carmelite history failing to consult the writings of John of Jerusalem and St. Cyril of Constantinople, upon whose testimony alone one could confidently rely in an important matter of this kind.³ Having incidentally mentioned the names of these four famous men—Bradley, Walden, Baconthorpe, and FitzRalph—it is only right that I should refer the reader to the *Dictionary of National Biography* for their more generally known claims to renown; but those possessing 'special knowledge' of the works which I have quoted will instantly perceive the necessity of taking the statements made in the respective notices with prudent reserve.⁴

¹ *Doctrinale Fidei*, t. iii. (Venice ed. 1571), p. 171, col. 1. Numerous MS. copies of this famous work are to be found in different public libraries, one of the most beautifully written being that presented by the Abbot of St. Albans (John Whethamstede) to the Benedictine monks studying at Oxford. Lib. ii. is now preserved at the British Museum, MS. Reg. 8, G. x.

² MS. Bodley 73, f. 99.

³ University Library of Cambridge, MS. Ff. 6. 11.

⁴ *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, vol. li. p. 147 (Scrope); vol. xl. p. 231 (Netter); vol. ii. p. 379; vol. xix. p. 194.

Frequent allusion has been made to the ancient codices containing what we *must* regard as the essential basis of the history of the Carmelite Order ; so it remains for me to say where some of the MS. copies of Riboti's volume can be examined by the student anxious to submit those four treatises to the test of any standard of scientific scrutiny recognized in our own exacting age. With exception of a very desirable contemporary copy, which I have myself consulted,¹ I know of the existence of only one other such ancient codex easy of access to English-speaking readers—that preserved among the MSS. in the Lambeth Palace Library.² However, I have come across several medieval examples in public libraries on the Continent, taken, of course, from suppressed monasteries of the Order.³ The Lambeth MS. is all the more interesting because bound up with the Latin text we have Bishop Bradley's quaint English translation (made *c.* A.D. 1430), which Bale describes as an elegant rendering of the original, and upon which he freely draws for those 'Collections' so highly prized by certain modern writers.⁴

As comparatively few of my readers may be in a position to turn this information to practical account, I would suggest, as an alternative, recourse to the first printed edition of Riboti's volume, included in the *Speculum Ordinis*, published at Venice, A.D. 1507—over one hundred and fifty years before the date (A.D. 1668) of that controversy in which, according to the new *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the opponents of the Carmelites 'rejected these stories [concerning the origin of the Order] as fables.' Most of the greater public libraries possess a copy of this edition,

¹ This valuable MS. was recently secured at a public auction in Italy. It is written in a clear hand of the period (1370). I have found the text singularly accurate, containing just a few clerical blunders in the writing of proper names—including Riboti's!—about which there can be no doubt. It bears a former press-marking, 'A. 9, 241.'

² MS. 192.

³ I may instance those preserved in the public libraries at Munich (Royal Lib.), MS. 471, ff. 85 sqq.; Semur, MS. 28, f. 62 sqq.; Clermont-Ferrand, MS. 156; Paris (B. de l' Arsenal), MS. 779.

⁴ Cotton MS. (British Museum), Titus D. X.—MS. Harley 540, contains the extracts—'e Philippo Ribot'—made by John Stowe, the Chronicler.

which is faulty only in matters of unimportant detail.¹ A later edition of the book *On the Institution of the First Monks* appears in the *Magna Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*; but De la Bigne, relying on the authority of Cardinal Baronius, considers the authorship of the treatise doubtful.² I will merely remark that the learned Bradley's admonition is most applicable to the eminent annalist's attitude in respect of this question; for the book itself furnishes the manifest solution of the difficulty which had occurred to Baronius.³ Whereas the principal objection urged by recent writers—the use of texts from the Vulgate, instead of from the Septuagint version of the Sacred Scriptures—needs no solution at all: it serves as a most forcible argument in favour of the authenticity of the treatise, as anyone could tell from the narrative of St. Cyril of Constantinople.⁴ Neither will the critical reader be inclined to attach much importance to De la Bigne's own private opinion on the subject, when he finds that editor including some of the quotations—added by way of illustration—as if part of the original text: a blunder all the more inexcusable because of the scrupulous care with which Riboti guarded against the mere possibility of such an oversight on the part of those consulting his volume.⁵

This might be considered a favourable opportunity for

¹ *Speculum Ordinis Fratrum Gloriosissimæ Dei Genitricis Semperque Virginis Mariæ de Monte Carmeli. Per Reverendum Sacræ Theologiæ Magistrum Baptistam Venetum de Cathaneis, ejusdem Sacri Ordinis, magna cum diligentia emendatum. Anno Domini, MCCCCVII., xx. chal. Aprilis.* This most useful 'Collection' was printed by the well-known 'Lucas Antonius' (T.C.D. Library, DD. d. 20.)

² T. iv. Colon. Agripp. 1618.

³ Chap. xvii. Lambeth MS. 192 (or *Speculum Ordinis*), l. iii. cap. i.

⁴ *The Catholic Encyclopædia* (vol. iii. p. 354 sqq., New York, 1908) contains a lengthy article, in which it is asserted: 'At the present time the question of the antiquity of the Carmelite Order has hardly more than academical interest'! In this instance a formidable list of 'authorities' appears at the end, not one of which affords a particle of positive evidence in support of the writer's erroneous views. His ignorance of the medieval history of the Irish Church led him to venture a surmise which really the editors of an 'International Work of Reference' should have been qualified to suppress.

⁵ 'Nam, quia non ambigo omnem humani eloquii sermonem calumnie, et contradictioni aemulorum semper fuisse obnoxium; studui allegare literis rubeis auctores, et libros a quibus sumuntur sententiæ, et auctoritates insertæ in hoc volumine; ut singuli eas in fonte suo legere valeant priusquam despiciant.' Lambeth MS. 192 (or *Speculum Ordinis*) 'Prologus.'

a digression on the controversy of the seventeenth century brought under our notice once more by the writer in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica*. But even if I had space at my disposal I should not dream of thus trespassing on the reader's patience, and for the reason which I have already assigned. Still, I may suggest that if the Carmelites of that period had not suffered themselves to be drawn into the discussion of irrelevant matters, the evidential value of the official sources of information concerning the origin of the Order would, in my opinion, have weighed more seriously with their opponents. In any case it could only prove a thankless task to attempt the refutation of arguments exclusively 'based on the negative evidence of history'—a subterfuge which the more critical protagonists of a cause silently ignore. I think, too, that they attach undue importance to the casual references occurring in the works of certain medieval writers who visited the Holy Land.¹

Take, for example, the passing allusion made to the community on Mount Carmel by the Greek monk, John Phocas. As an 'independent witness' he may be said to confirm the narrative of St. Cyril of Constantinople; but beyond this I fail to see the critical value of his evidence, or in what sense it could be compared with the absolutely conclusive testimony of the Saint. Nowadays it would be set down as the typical remark of an uninterested traveller. This is what Phocas says:—

Some years ago a white-haired monk, who was also a priest, came from Calabria, and through a revelation from the prophet Elias established himself in this place [Mount Carmel]. He enclosed a small portion of the ruins of the monastery, and built a tower and a little church, assembling in it about ten brothers, who, with him, inhabit at present [A.D. 1185] this holy place.²

¹ This, however, is not intended as a concession 'to the exigencies of rational criticism,' to which flippant essayists have recently appealed while sneering at the monastic traditions of the Carmelites, hoping to veil their own want of 'special knowledge' of the subject, and to impress unwary readers. I am not referring particularly to the article in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

² See *A Catholic Dictionary* (p. 120), quoted in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica*; also Migne, t. cxxxiii. col. 961, for the Greek text and Latin rendering of above passage.

Such the evidence of John Phocas. And it is, apparently, on the authority of this traveller that we are required to believe, according to the new *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 'the historical origin of the Carmelites must be placed at the middle of the twelfth century.' But who tells us that the 'white-haired monk' in question was St. Berthold—succeeded, as Prior-General, by St. Brocard, for whom Blessed Albert compiled the 'Primitive Carmelite Rule' from the book of the Patriarch John? Is no acknowledgment due to St. Cyril of Constantinople, the compatriot of John Phocas, who had the excelling advantage of being a member of the Order of Carmel at the very date of that Greek monk's visit to the Holy Land?¹

If the Saint does not furnish us with a complete chronology of events between the years 412 and 1099—which latter date marks a new epoch in the history of the Order—he has certainly left an admirable summary of the fate of the 'Hermits' after the subjugation of Palestine by the Saracens, A.D. 639. Compare the following with the casual remark to which I have just referred:—

Illo itaque tempore, quamvis pauci, verumtamen probatissimi monachi nostrae Religionis dimissis mansionibus, quas habebant in urbibus et villis, hunc Carmeli Montem non deserentes, jugiter in eo et in quibusdam aliis eremis Terrae Sanctae permanerunt, sub disciplina monasticae vitae eremiticae, per Eliam prophetam institutae, et in praedicto Joannis libro discriptae. Qui, sicut et caeteri Christiani hujus patriae, duro infidelium jugo dediti, multis tribulationibus et injuriis fuerunt a Paganis per annos circiter quadringentos sexaginta afflicti.²

What St. Cyril adds relative to the effect of the victory of Godfrey de Bouillon on the prospects of the Order in the East is, no doubt, confirmed by the 'testimony' of Phocas; but we are assured that the number of the Carmelites had been greatly increased owing to the advent of many pious pilgrims from Europe.³ John de Horneby was

¹ 'S. Cyrilli Constan. Liber,' cap. iv., Lambeth MS. lib. viii. c. 2.

² Ibid. cap. iii.; Lambeth MS. lib. viii. cap. i.

³ 'Quamplures enim devoti peregrini qui ab Occidenti supervenerunt odore hujus sancti loci tracti, et devotione Religiosorum eremitarum

in a position to produce, if required, far more valuable positive evidence in verification of the facts recorded by the Saint¹—whose narrative was written for the information of the religious themselves—to explain in what circumstances it had been deemed expedient by St. Brocard that the ‘Hermits of Carmel’ should conform to the usages of the Western Church in its legislation for monastic institutions. So that it is to St. Cyril’s forethought, in this respect, we owe the original draft of the Albertine Rule, already canonically sanctioned before the Lateran Council (Fourth), and afterwards formally confirmed by Pope Honorius III. This was a point which de Horneby had to establish to the entire satisfaction of his adversaries.² Finally, our Saint embodies an extremely significant biographical note in reference to the sources to which John of Jerusalem himself had access when composing his treatise *On the Institution of the First Monks* as an authoritative explanation of the origin of the Carmelites.³

To supplement this narrative William de Sanvico has left us a chronicle of the chief events leading up to the great migration of the ‘Hermits’ to Europe between the years 1238 and 1241, recording, moreover, the resultant condition of the Order in the Holy Land. For the most part his is the testimony of an eye-witness; and he alludes to the facts stated by St. Cyril as if universally known throughout the East.⁴ He attributes the opposition experienced by the Carmelites in Europe—especially in England—to a cause which would probably only excite derision on the part of recent critics of these religious, but of which others, not necessarily members of the Order, are

montem hunc inhabitantium permoti, mundo renunciabant, et per contemplationem coelestium se eorum contubernio jungebant’ (ibid. c. iii.).

N.B.—As a rule I quote from the Italian MS. A. 9., 241; but the reading is almost identical in the Lambeth MS. and in the *Speculum Ordinis*, ll.cc.

¹ MS. Bodley, e Mus. 86, f. 212b.

² Ibid. f. 197.

³ ‘S. Cyrilli Liber,’ cap. i.: ‘Quam [vitam] Joannes eis exponebat ex diversis dictis, tam veteris, quam novae Legis, et ex nonnullis tractatibus editis a professoribus praedecessoribus suis.’

⁴ *Chronica de Ordine Carmelitarum*, per Guilielmum de Sanvico, cap. i.

disposed to take a different view.¹ Mention is also made of the remedy to which the White Friars had recourse with happiest results : one that does not appeal, seemingly, to writers who consider the Brown Scapular of the Carmelites a theme to move the sceptical to ridicule, in this progressive age.²

Now that I have taxed the editor's consideration to the utmost, I feel the reader will possess, after all, but a poor idea of the indebtedness of the Carmelite Order to Philip Riboti, by whose action was insured the preservation of those treatises with which, in the first instance, the student of the history of the White Friars should deal. Not a few of that learned man's contemporaries had already compiled useful historical works drawn from these and other reliable sources ; but I have refrained from directing special attention to the fact, although I have been able to consult copies of the same in ancient codices. Indeed, the MS. materials of Carmelite history are much more abundant than our critics suppose ; and members of the Order with a taste for research work receive every practical encouragement to devote themselves to the discovery of such ancient writings, indispensable for perfecting the annals of each Province, and for further elucidating those claims rendered obligatory amongst the religious by a Rule which primarily owes its origin to the zeal of the Patriarch John.³

When carried out methodically investigation of this kind is exceedingly tedious ; still, in the end, it well repays the labour expended ; and, in the case of the Carmelites—it has demonstrated with what prudent reserve one should accept the opinions of those whose 'special knowledge'—when they can lay claim to so much—concerning the history

¹ Ibid. cap. vii. : 'Quod diabolus contra multiplicationem hujus Religionis fortius bellum moverit ; et qualiter haec Religio de ipso triumphaverit.'

² 'Virgo itaque Maria Priori eorum revelavit. . . .' (Ibid. ; Lambeth MS. 192, lib. ix. cap. v. ; also MS. A. 9, 241.)

³ As the subject-matter of the book *On the Institution of the First Monks* proclaims the holiness of its author, the opponents of the Carmelites had begun to discover a great deal that reflected unfavourably on John of Jerusalem ; until suddenly it dawned upon them that, if the allegations were true, the argument could only confirm the authenticity of the traditions of the Order.

of this Order is gleaned from the 'Collections' of John Bale:¹ this, and a certain familiarity with some of the many books occasioned by that controversy of the seventeenth century, to which recently such frequent reference has been made; but never once so as to enlighten readers regarding the existence of the really critical works issued to represent the position of the Carmelites from the historical point of view.²

To the non-Catholic expert an attempt at original research might seem inconceivable in any frame of mind but that which implied absolute indifference to the result, so far as the investigation should establish or refute some accepted tradition. He would decline to consider the question of environment, under the influence of which one might endeavour to achieve a given purpose impartially, in no way impeded by the certain consciousness that, sooner or later, the inquiry must reveal the incontestable depository of what many are wont to regard in the light of a sacred heritage. When otherwise competent to undertake the task I can see no reason why the earnest efforts of such a one should not eventually lead him to sources of information quite as authentic as those which assisted the distinguished Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge to conclude that the traditions received by Irish Catholics concerning St. Patrick's work are 'generally nearer historical fact than the views of some anti-Papal divines,' who, I dare say, would plead 'the exigencies of rational criticism.'³ The parallel may or may not be admissible in the present instance; and I do not submit it as an argument. Neither can it affect my own personal gratification in thinking it was loyalty to the monastic

¹ Besides—judging from the difficulties of these same writers—it is not always easy to distinguish between Bale's interpolations and the text from which he is supposed to quote. I allude especially to MS. Harley 3838, cap. xviii., 'Ex Siberto de Beka.' There is less danger of ambiguity when he adds (as in cap. liii.) 'Ex proprio cerebro.'

² I may not refer to these works by naming their authors for a reason which the editor will appreciate.

³ *The Life of St. Patrick, and his Place in History*, by J. B. Bury (London, 1905), p. vii. sqq.

traditions of my Order that insured for me the privilege of entering this protest on behalf of the Carmelites against the latest gibe at the remote antiquity of our origin which appears in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica*. If strongly influenced by environment in doing so, I am quite confident of not having incurred the least risk of being biased on this account—sure that the positive evidence at my disposal could only enable me to help in forwarding the inviolable cause of truth.

JAMES P. RUSHE, O.D.C.

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

THE *Explanatio Symboli* of Nicetas of Remesiana contains the first version of the Creed in which the words 'Communion of Saints' are added to the more ancient formula. This commentary goes to show that Nicetas regarded the addition as an expansion of the preceding phrase, 'the Holy Catholic Church.' There are modern writers, including some eminent Catholic scholars, who hold that this author regarded the terms 'Catholic Church' and 'Communion of Saints' as synonymous, the latter phrase being merely an appositional expansion of the former. Closely related as the two ideas evidently are, we seem to recognize in the added member something more than a mere apposition.

After having confessed the Holy Trinity [he writes] you profess that you believe in the Holy Catholic Church. What is the Church but the assembly of all the saints? From the beginning of the world, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, all the just men who have been, who are, or who shall be, are one only Church; even the angels are included in this one Church. Believe therefore that in this one Church you shall obtain the Communion of saints. Know that this one Church is the Catholic Church established throughout the world, to whose communion you must hold fast. There are other so-called Churches, but you have nothing in common with them.¹

It is plain that the use of the term Catholic Church in this passage is not univocal throughout. In the first part of the quotation it is employed in a broad sense—including saints living and dead—in the second, a narrower signification is given: that of the existing Church on earth. In the belief of Nicetas, association with the militant Church

¹ Op. cit., P. L., col. 871.

implies citizenship in the broad kingdom of which the Church on earth is but a province. If this interpretation is correct we find here the concept which is familiar to all theologians—a social organism existing partly upon earth and partly beyond this world. This unity forms the basis of many relations of part with part, which exhibit themselves in religious practices, devotions, intercessions, all having their foundation in the solidarity wrought by the redeeming grace of Christ.

This conception was not a late arrival in the history of theological development; its features are older than Christianity itself. God to the chosen people was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; the dead past was vitally united with the living present. The future, too, was destined also to be gathered into the kingdom. As the fullness of time approached, the Messianic hope grew stronger in the ancient race; national dreams, patriotic utopias mingled with more authentic prophecies. The domination of Israel was expected; the kingdom of God and the Gospel came instead. In the New Testament is to be observed the discreet substitution of the idea of a spiritual kingdom in the place of the looked-for temporal reign of a King-Messias.

Our Lord's preaching returns again and again to the thought of the 'Kingdom of God' or the 'Kingdom of Heaven,' which He has come to set up in the midst of men—a reign which is visible in its manifest effects, but spiritual and invisible in its source. It is not to be exclusively Jewish, nor indeed wholly of this world. It is to seek its consummation in the heavens,¹ where men shall live angelic lives without marriage or giving in marriage; where there shall be no death, but everlasting life in God.²

Even before this peace is attained, heaven interests itself in the victories of the Church on earth, and the angels of God rejoice over the repentance of a sinner.³

Later, St. Paul frames the theology of the 'Communion

¹ Matt. xix. 29.

³ Luke xv. 10.

² Luke xx. 30, and foll.

of Saints.' Taking his data from the teaching of Christ, and the earliest Christian tradition, he exhibits the idea under other images. The Church is the fullness of Christ. It is the organism of which He is the head.¹ He indeed is its sovereign ruler, placed over it by God the Father. Charity flowing down from God and from His Son, binds the whole body together, and fulfils the divine purpose not only here but in eternity; 'it never falleth away.' This supremacy of Christ stretches beyond the boundaries of present existence, and embraces 'all principality and power, and virtue and dominion and every name that is named, not only in this world, but in the world to come.'² For God has given to Jesus a name which is above all names, 'that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of those that are in heaven, and earth and under the earth.'³

St. John the Divine closes the Revelation of the new alliance by a grand tableau—the Heavenly Jerusalem, in which God's glory is the light, and the Lamb the lamp: the city whose gates are wide open to receive all who are written in the book of life.⁴

Thus the New Testament images, under varied metaphor or symbol, a spiritual citizenship, a union of spirits, in which earth and heaven, time and eternity, human nature and angelic are gathered into a vast scheme of grace and glory. It is from this complex and fruitful idea that has developed the doctrine which we call the Communion of Saints, and from which has sprung a multitude of practices that have given it a prominent place in Christian and Catholic life.⁵

It was principally during the fourth and fifth centuries that these practices obtained their full development, and

¹ Col. i. 18.

² Eph. i. 20.

³ Phil. ii. 9, 10.

⁴ Apoc. xxi. 10-27.

⁵ It is regrettable that the article on the Communion of Saints in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* is so short. Would that a few pages had been snatched from, say, the Huron Indians and given to this unquestionably more important subject.

the doctrine its definite precision. For this reason the early Christian centuries, which connect the Apostolic time with the period of the fullest expansion of the idea, are for the theologian among the most interesting, if not indeed the most interesting, subject of investigation. We will, then, trace the general features of the doctrine from the Apostolic times to about the year 300.

And first, as a preliminary, we will mention the sources of information at our disposal. These may be summarily classed as (a) literary and (b) monumental. It has only recently been recognized how useful this second class of evidence is. Tombs and their inscriptions, statues and mural decorations now take no subordinate place among the material of the ecclesiastical historian and the theologian. In the earliest Christian age both classes of evidence are woefully incomplete. The growth of Christian literature and Christian art was slow, and gaps occur in each domain which cannot be satisfactorily bridged by any amount of ingenious conjecture. In the period of which we are treating we have, moreover, scarcely any record of the text of the liturgy, and but little even indirect reference which could throw full light on it.¹ There are only about half a dozen writers who have left treatises of any considerable fullness, and in the case of these there are many omissions to disappoint our curiosity. Inscriptions, too, are exceedingly rare. For instance, Rome was certainly a city conspicuous for the number of its Christian inhabitants, yet De Rossi could only count thirty-two Roman Christian inscriptions which were anterior to the time of Constantine, and of these only one—and that brief and unimportant—belonged to the first century.²

In looking down the lists of catalogued inscriptions it will be seen that there are very few either in the city or the province which are of any use in this investigation, though, as we shall see presently, there do exist some which are of priceless service.

¹ See Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, chap. ii. sec. i.

² De Rossi, *Inscr. Christ. Urbis Romae*.

In short, we are in the position of men who inherit from these obscure centuries, not libraries of Christian literature and antiquities, but a few stray volumes only. The argument from silence, then, must be most sparingly used when treating of a period where so few voices travel to us.

Leaving these preliminary considerations—rather obvious and arid, I fear—we turn to the details of the evidence. A convenient grouping of this will be found in treating the subject according to the divisions made in most manuals of theology, viz., the Communion of Saints as expressed in the spiritual relations of the faithful on earth (1) among themselves, (2) towards the faithful departed, (3) towards the saints in Heaven.

THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF THE FAITHFUL ON EARTH

The Epistle of St. Clement of Rome contains a passage which if not strictly a liturgical formula is, according to the opinion of Duchesne and others, modelled after the manner of the prayer used at public worship. It is a beautiful example of a prayer of universal charity :—

May the revealed number of the elect in the whole world be preserved intact by the Creator of all things through His well-beloved Son, Jesus Christ, by whom He has called us from darkness to light, from ignorance to the knowledge of the glory of His name. . . . Thou who givest riches and poverty, death and life, sole Benefactor of spirits, God of all flesh ; Thou whose regard penetrates the abyss and scans the works of men ; Thou who art our help in danger, Thou who savest us from despair, Creator and Overseer of all spirits ; Thou who hast multiplied the nations of the earth, and chosen from among them those who love Thee through Jesus Christ, Thy well-beloved servant, by whom Thou hast instructed, sanctified, and honoured us. We beseech Thee, O Master, be our help and succour.¹

The prayer goes on to ask for blessings for all the needs of Christian people, the just and sinners, the prisoners, the sick, the frail and tempted.

¹ The translation is from Duchesne's *Christian Worship*, ii. sec. 1.

From the first principles of the religion of Christ it followed that Christians must pray for all—for enemies as well as friends, for rulers, even though they were persecutors. But it is easy to observe that the ancient forms of prayer gave the first and most honourable place to the petitions made on behalf of the faithful. ‘The Martyrdom of Polycarp,’ composed within a year of the death of the illustrious and venerated Bishop in 155, twice mentions this custom of praying for the universal Church.¹ ‘In his retreat,’ the Martyrologist says, ‘he [Polycarp] passed days and nights in continual prayer, according to his custom, for the universal Church.’ Towards the close of the recital he thus speaks of the martyr:—

After having withstood an unjust judge, he was the victor, and received the crown of immortality; united to the Apostles and all the just, he glorifies God, the all-powerful, gives thanks to Jesus Christ, the Saviour of our souls, the Master of our bodies, the Shepherd of the Catholic Church spread throughout the entire world.

Intercession for the Church, then, was evidently a noteworthy feature of the religious life of the early Christian communities. The forms of prayer which were used remind us particularly of those very ancient prayers in our own liturgy: the Bidding prayers used by the Church on Good Friday. The extract from the Epistle of St. Clement, and a reference to St. Cyprian’s Epistle vii., *ad Clerum*, abundantly proves this similarity.² Another point may be mentioned briefly here, the instinct which drove the primitive Christians to look on the sufferings of their fellow-believers as efficacious, not only in the case of the one who endured them, but also on behalf of those who were his associates in the faith. It is here that is to be found the germ of the practice of indulgences. The confessors in prison during the persecution in the middle of the third century were accustomed to ransom some of the penitents

¹ Mart. Polycarp, *Ruimart Acta sincera* (1689), p. 23.

² Ep. vii. *ad Clerum* (P. L. iv. 257).

by the price of their own sufferings. They gave, sometimes indiscriminately, tickets which exempted public penitents from the full performance of the prescribed penances. So convinced were the faithful of the value of this vicarious satisfaction that there arose a danger in Africa of treating these tickets as if they were direct exemptions, instead of petitions made by the confessors to the Bishops on behalf of the penitents. St. Cyprian was forced to intervene, and set the matter in its proper light.¹

It would carry us too far to enter further into this matter, yet it seemed fitting to mention it, since it has no slight bearing on the doctrine and instinct of the Church with regard to vicarious suffering. It is a subject that interests not only dogmatic theology but ascetical and mystical theology also.

PRAYER FOR THE DEAD

The beautiful and touching practice of praying for the dead flowed directly from Judaism into the Christian Church. It was a practice that was characteristic of the Semitic religions.² The classical argument for the Christian practice is usually sought in a book of the Old Testament Scripture.³ Another passage—this from the New Testament—is not so frequently quoted, possibly on account of the doubt which may exist as to its interpretation. The name of Onesiphorus, a benefactor of St. Paul, occurs twice in the Second Epistle to Timothy.⁴ St. Paul's gratitude for the favours of his friend here takes the form of the pious wish, 'The Lord grant to him to find mercy of the Lord on that day.' From the fact that St. Paul recommends himself in the Epistle not to Onesiphorus, or to Onesiphorus and his family, but to 'the household of Onesiphorus,' it has been reasonably conjectured that his friend was dead at the time when the Epistle was sent.

¹ Cf. especially Ep. xviii. 1, 2.

² Lagrange, *Etudes sur les religions semitiques*, 1903, p. 295.

³ 2 Mach. xii. 43-46.

⁴ i. 16-18; iv. 16-19.

This interpretation has been adopted by Dr. Swete, the learned Anglican.¹

But it is not solely, nor indeed principally, from the Sacred Scriptures that evidence is furnished for the antiquity of the usage. The pious reverence for the dead is written plainly across the early days of Christianity. Never perhaps has the sense of the common brotherhood of living and dead been so intimate and so real as in that first period of intense spiritual life. The thought that Christ, the Lord of the dead and the living, might at any time appear to unite His two great kingdoms hangs over the first Christian communities as they kneel round the tombs of their departed brethren. The late Gaston Boissier, with his fine genius for understanding the soul of antiquity, has dwelt on this feature in an essay on the Roman catacombs. He is guiding his readers through the long subterranean galleries which sometimes open out into the larger chambers of the catacombs :—

From time to time our attention is called to a little niche in the sombre walls we are passing, or to a console jutting out ; here the clay lamp was placed to light visitors. How many times have friends and relations passed before it, to pray and weep by a cherished tomb ! We pause a moment in these chambers, more roomy than the others, at the end of which we find a tomb disposed in the form of an altar. Signor Rossi tells us that they were used for family meetings. People gathered there on funeral anniversaries to implore the mercy of God for the departed. ‘To read together the holy books, and to sing hymns in honour of the dead who sleep in the Lord.’ It is easy to imagine the effect which such ceremonies must have produced upon pious souls. In the midst of this solemn silence, between these walls lined with corpses, they seemed to live quite in the company of those they had lost. The emotion that seized them brought home more clearly that oneness of the dead with the living, which paganism had recognized, and the Church made one of its dogmas. They felt so full of all those dear memories that it required no effort to believe that death cannot break the bonds which bind man to man, and that they

¹ *Journal of Theological Studies*, viii. 500.

continue to render each other mutual services beyond life—some profiting by the prayers of the Church, others, who enjoy celestial beatitude, helping those who still live by their intercession.¹

Christian epitaphs in the catacombs preserve for us the prayers and sighs that sounded round the tombs of the dead. We choose a few from the most ancient, which, as a rule, are the briefest and the most spontaneous: 'Regina, mayest thou live in the Lord Jesus'; 'May thy spirit rest well in God'; 'May God refresh thee'; 'In peace'; 'In Christ.'² From the provinces also, though less abundantly, comes evidence of the same holy custom. The most important, perhaps, of all Christian inscriptions is the epitaph of Abercius of Hieropolis in Phrygia Salutaris. The reconstruction of this epitaph was brought about by what can almost be called an archaeological romance. Abercius, according to an ancient 'life,' probably composed some time in or about the sixth century, was a Phrygian Bishop of great fame as a pilgrim, apostle, and wonder-worker, who lived in the second century, and after many travels, including a pilgrimage to Rome, died in his episcopal city, Hieropolis. According to this narrative, the Bishop composed an epitaph for himself, which the hagiographer inserted in the narrative of his life. The biography, bearing evidence as it did of late origin, and being somewhat overloaded with miracles, gained no very great credit with historical critics. And, as was natural, the discredit which fell upon the 'Life' attached itself also to the remarkable epitaph which was incorporated in it. In 1882, however, Mr. Ramsay, while exploring a small canton in Phrygia, found the remains of three cities, Bronzos, Obrous, and Hieropolis. In the neighbourhood he discovered a metrical inscription in Greek, dated 216, of the Christian era, which practically coincided with the first and the last lines of the epitaph in the 'Life.' But instead of Abercius, it was 'Alexander the son of Anthony' who had thus prepared his tomb. Another visit of the same explorer, in 1883,

¹ Gaston Boissier, *Rome and Pompeii*, pp. 158, 159.

² From Part iii. *Roma Sotterranea*, Northcote and Brownlow.

brought to light fragments of another slab whose inscription was sufficient to authenticate the middle portion of the epitaph contained in the biography.¹ Its importance is quite exceptional on many grounds; De Rossi writes of it as 'inter christiana (epigrammata) facile princeps'; but what concerns us at present is the evidence it gives of the custom of praying for the dead. Here are the terms in which Abercius appeals for prayers: 'I, Abercius, have ordered these things to be written being at the age of sixty and twelve truly. Let the brother who hath understanding pray for Abercius.' It is quite possible that this Bishop, when in Rome, had had the thought of asking for prayers on an epitaph suggested to him by the sight of the inscriptions in the Christian cemeteries.

Another celebrated monument belonging to the second or third century was discovered in 1839 during some building operations at Autun. The language, like that of the epitaph of Abercius, is Greek. This inscription of Pectorius is undated, but the style, the symbolism, and the Greek language give a clue to its antiquity. The prayer of Pectorius for the repose of his mother's soul is thus expressed: 'Give a sweet rest to my mother, O Thou Light of the Dead.'²

Let us now pass to the literary and liturgical evidence. The custom of praying for the dead during the Holy Sacrifice is attested by documents dating from the last part of the second century, and there is no reason to believe that it was even then a novelty. Africa is especially explicit in the testimony it affords in favour of this liturgical practice. 'We make offerings on behalf of the dead on annual days,' writes Tertullian.³ St. Cyprian in one of his letters indicates the same custom in yet more unequivocal terms.⁴

Tertullian's witness is all the more important because of its greater antiquity. His belief was that all souls—save

¹ For the full text of the epitaph, with a clear commentary, see Dom H. Leclercq's article, ad verb. 'Abercius,' in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*.

² For a full account of this monument see *Dict. d'Archéologie et de Liturgie*, ad verb. 'Autun.'

³ Tert., *De Corona*, iii.

⁴ Cyp., Ep. i. 2, *Sacrificium pro dormitione*.

the greatly privileged souls of the martyrs—awaited their final destiny in Hades. The just and the unjust found a place there. There it was that sins were expiated by punishment until the ‘last farthing’ had been paid.¹ Meanwhile the faithful on earth prayed for the departed, and caused sacrifice to be offered for them. In one of his spirited and intolerant treatises he introduces a widow praying for her dead husband: ‘Then she prays for her soul and makes appeal for his comfort and fellowship in the first resurrection, and makes an offering on the anniversary days of his decease.’² In the Acts of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas and Companions³ there is a passage which, while it is in a sense perplexing, shows plainly the custom of offering private prayers for the dead. Perpetua writes:—

As we were all praying, suddenly in the midst of prayer a voice burst from me, and I named Dinocrates: and I marvelled that he had never come into my mind till then, and I grieved when I remembered what had befallen him; and I felt at once that I was in a position to pray for him, and ought to do so. And I began to pray much for him and to make moaning to the Lord. Straightway that same night it was shown to me in this wise: I saw Dinocrates coming out of a gloomy place, where there were many others besides, exceedingly hot and thirsty, with his countenance dirty and wan in colour, and the wound in his face which he had when he died. This Dinocrates had been my brother in the flesh, of seven years old, who had been ill and died a painful death with cancer of the face, so that his death was a horror to everybody. For him then I had prayed; and between him and me there was a great gulf fixed, so that neither of us could go to the other. Next, in the place where Dinocrates was, there was a tank full of water, with a brink too high for the boy’s stature, and Dinocrates was stretching himself as if to drink. I was sad that the tank should hold water and yet he should be unable to drink, because of the height of the brink of it. And I awoke and understood that my brother was in trouble. . . . I prayed for my brother day and night, groaning and weeping that he might be given to me. On the day when

¹ Tert., *De Anima*, 55, 58.

² Monag. 10, ‘refrigerium iterum adpostulat ei.’

³ Suffered in 202 or 203. Acta in Hurter’s *Opuscula*, vol. xiii.

we remained in the stocks, it was shown to me in this wise. I saw the place which I had seen before, and Dinocrates with his body cleansed and well clad, taking his refreshment. And where the wound was, I saw the flesh closed up; and the tank which I had seen before, I now saw with the brink lowered to the boy's waist; and water ran over from it without ceasing; and on the brink was a golden stoup full of water; and Dinocrates went up and began to drink from it, and that stoup failed not to be full. And when he had had enough, he went away to play after the manner of children rejoicing. And I awoke. Then I understood that he was removed from his punishment.¹

Outside Africa there does not seem to be direct evidence within the compass of these three centuries for a liturgical commemoration of the souls of the faithful departed.² This silence, nevertheless, need not appear equivalent to a positive argument against the universality of the practice. Writing of a rather later period Father Pierson justly observes:—

The custom of praying for the dead during the Eucharistic function is made clear from the use of diptychs in the early Church. These were folding charts which contained the names of the deceased. They are mentioned in the oldest liturgies, and cannot but have an early origin. Mindful of her children in life, the Church showed an equal solicitude for them in death. It is not surprising then that St. Chrysostom should voice a tradition that this commemoration of the dead was commanded by the Apostles themselves. 'It was not in vain that the Apostles ordained that at the tremendous mysteries the departed should be remembered.'³

¹ Translation, Dr. Mason, *Historic Martyrs of the Primitive Church*. Dr. Mason mentions the difficulty to which I referred, viz., that Perpetua had not prayed for Dinocrates 'without doubt because he had died unbaptized.' St. Augustine thus solves the question: 'Quis igitur scit utrum puer ille post baptismum, persecutionis tempore a patre impio per idolatriam fuerit alienatus a Christo, propter quod in damnationem mortis ierit nisi pro Christo morituræ sororis precibus donatus exierit' *De Anima et ejus origine*, lib. i.

² Origen may be cited as a witness for belief in purgatory, and for an opinion that the souls of the dead take their place in the Christian assembly, hovering round the altar. He believed that the dead prayed for the living, but there is no certain passage in which he speaks of the prayers of the living for the dead.

³ I. E. RECORD, October, 1908, p. 372.

To sum up this section : The evidence, broken as it is, goes to establish the custom of praying for the dead from the beginning of Christianity. From the second century the dead were commemorated in the Holy Eucharist, and for all we know this may have been an equally primitive custom.

There remains yet to be reviewed the ancient testimony for the veneration of the saints. This we hope to attempt in another article.

W. B. O'Dowd.

SPAIN AND ITS RELIGIOUS ORDERS

AT the present moment all true friends of the Catholic Church are watching with profound anxiety the conduct of the Liberal government in dealing with the religious problem in Spain. The acts of the present ministry are well calculated to justify such a feeling. In the short space of six months they have, first, recalled their Ambassador from Rome, for the time being at least; secondly, by a new interpretation of an old law, intended to enjoin the contrary, they have given permission to all sects to display their religious emblems openly in the face of an entirely Catholic nation; thirdly, they have suppressed the 'oath' in the tribunals of justice for all those who do not wish to take it; and, finally, they have succeeded in passing through the 'Senate' the much-talked 'Ley del Candado' or the 'Lock-Law,' which renders impossible the erection of any new convents in Spain, at least as long as the present Prime Minister continues to guide the destinies of the nation. The 'Lock-Law' itself only prescribes authorization from the Minister of Grace and Justice for the founding of a new religious house; but the Prime Minister, Señor Canalejas, went further, and during the discussion of the law in the Senate declared that the permission which was made essential by the law would never be granted while he remained in power. Señor Canalejas is undoubtedly the inspirer of all these innovations; he takes every opportunity of professing the fact publicly; and so wedded was he to the Lock-Law, that he threatened the Senate with his resignation if they did not pass it for him.

On learning so much about Señor Canalejas and his achievements, any outsider would naturally be inclined to regard him as the most violent Jacobin that has appeared in the political arena during the last hundred years. But let us look at the other side of the picture. On October 29, 1910, in reply to a speech delivered by the Bishop of Madrid,

Señor Canalejas declared that, as the Bishop, like a patriotic Spaniard, spoke of the Fatherland with enthusiasm, so he himself, as a sincere Catholic, spoke of the Church ; and later, he said, that he did not know a single member of the Liberal party who had not been brought up in the loving bosom of the Catholic Church. Further, on November 3, he added that in the lay world (and he was one of the most prominent laicists, though very religious and a firm believer) there was no hostile disposition, but, on the contrary, great affection was entertained towards the Church and its prelates. Finally, he exclaimed that the separation of Church and State in Spain would be *dolorosa*, for they are intimately joined together as soul and body.

What, then, are we to think of the Spanish Prime Minister ? Are we to regard him as the sincere Catholic and loving son of the Church he professes to be, or are we to judge him by his acts and brand him a dangerous enemy of religion ? It is impossible to give a direct answer to any question connected with the ponderous tangled skein of Spanish politics. But whatever may be said about the matters in dispute between the Holy See and Señor Canalejas, there can be but one opinion about the extreme indelicacy, want of formality, and even injustice, in legislating alone on questions which, according to the Concordat itself and Spanish law, should be regarded as *mixed*, and legislated on by the civil power in accord with the Vatican. To the foreigner, the attitude of Señor Canalejas, giving expression to the sentiments I have quoted, and at the same time forcing the anti-clerical policy I have chronicled, must seem a strange phenomenon ; but to anyone who makes a deeper study of the political situation in Spain, it will appear just on a par with the innumerable anomalies that exist in this country.

The Spaniards are not by any means a political people : they regard politics as a special profession (not at all the most honourable in the nation), and believe that the shaping of the Fatherland should be left to the politicians. At the same time, they are very interested in political happenings, which are the never-ending theme of conversation, but their

interest does not go beyond criticism of the government. Everybody outside the political ring condemns the government. If ever there was a case where an opinion could be proved from the *sensus communis*, this is one in point ; and we are justified in agreeing with the everyday Spaniard who repeats, 'Spain has every natural advantage, fine harbours, a rich soil, abundance of minerals, and the life-giving sun in the heavens but the government does nothing to help us.' I believe the failure of the successive governments in Spain is attributable to their want of authority, which want is due to historical causes and to the peculiar temperament of the Spanish people itself. We shall see later on what these historical causes are, for the present let us examine some of the rebellious qualities of the Spanish character.

The Spaniard is proud—of course, I am speaking generally—but his exquisite courtesy robs the vice of nearly all its evil : there is nothing repulsive in the glowing features of the stately hidalgo, who recounts to you the glories of his ancestors, the lustre of his country's saints, or the beauty of the national buildings. But the same spirit tends to isolate him and discourage co-operation. When he has work to do, he feels power in himself to do it ; nay, his self-sufficiency often urges him to patronize those round him. Any length of time spent in instructing the tyro, discussing the plans of a neighbour, or guiding a stranger is never regarded as mis-spent, hence the national fame for politeness. The Spaniard is an idealist : he is far more happy when discussing some contingency, some alluring 'might have-been,' or recounting some episode he has witnessed or heard of, than he is when meditating the ways and means of the domestic budget. 'Not in bread alone doth man live' ; he is optimistic and courageous, for him the future has no terrors. The Spaniard is eminently charitable : seldom will he pass the beggar in the street who, taking a cigarette from his mouth, confidently appeals to him : 'Brother, give me an alms, and God will repay you.' The number of charitable institutions under lay or clerical direction in the country is very large. And here we might add, in a perverted sense,

'Charity covereth a multitude of sins.' It is almost an axiom that you cannot dismiss a man and leave him and his family to starve. And, as a result, how often do we see the negligent postman, the unjust train official, the unfaithful servant, or the useless policeman of eighty years, allowed to muddle along to the end of the chapter, or reinstated in office after dismissal. Of course I do not mean to imply that all or even a large number of Spanish officials are useless or unfaithful; but merely to point out the tendency to condone inefficiency. And then, as might be expected, the name of charity is often pronounced when influence or the desire of popularity are the real motives. On February 21 last the Liberal government pardoned 1,733 criminals of all kinds, who were under sentence from the civil courts, and 157 who had been sentenced by the military courts. It is customary to grant general pardons from time to time; and woe to the man who goes against *custom* in Spain. Custom is far more revered than the law itself. This phenomenon is accounted for by the independence of the Spanish character, which recognized in the custom its own personal sanction but in the law the mandate of an outsider who happened to be a legislator. Señor Canalejas, speaking in the Senate on November 4, said: 'I admit that there is in the national spirit, not merely in one section or element, a propensity to insubordination.' With the laws of God it is different: one's dignity is in no way debarred by submitting to the commands of the Omnipotent; and this explains the profound religious convictions of the nation as a whole.

To make a complete psychological examination of the Spanish character would take more time and space than the limits of the present article would allow, but there is just one other trait I should like to glance at, in order that we may better understand the difficulties of Spanish governments and the arguments bandied about in the discussion of the recent 'Lock-Law.'

The adventurous spirit of the conquerors of Italy, Mexico, and Peru still continues to exercise its influence on their descendants; all are ever ready to try their luck

in some new enterprise. One hears of beggars putting their pittance into the National lottery, and bearing the reverse quite stoically when they fail to win a prize. I have heard of military officers and schoolmasters, in middle life, becoming priests, youths of good family becoming *toreros*, professors of literature at the university becoming qualified lawyers, parish priests becoming curates and chaplains, etc.; the list is interminable. The priest who to-day has a parish in Vitoria, in the north of Spain, may hold another ecclesiastical office 400 miles away, in Seville, before the end of the month.

Even the bishops commence in the less important dioceses, and are promoted gradually by the government, with the consent of Rome, to the more populous centres and archbishoprics. So that in Spain there is very little stability, everything is in a state of flux, and we know the dangers which the house runs that is built on the shifting sands. Past governments have tried to conciliate the people by setting up a vast number of State positions, but the result has been wretchedly small salaries and general discontent. No government can afford to ignore public opinion, and this condition of things is a great source of weakness to the rulers: they only think of calming a troublesome section or pleasing an influential body, rather than putting their own ideals for the betterment of the country into execution. Add to these difficulties the evil legacy of centuries of disunion, and especially the dissensions that have cropped up during the last hundred years. Most people regard Spain as a homogeneous people but the facts are quite otherwise: at one time there were several kings in the Peninsula. The Catalans regard themselves as a distinct people; so do the Aragonese, the Basques, and the Valencians. The ordinary Castilian cannot understand the Basque language, the Catalan, or Valencian and only with difficulty the Asturian. Catalonia has been a thorn in the side of Spain ever since the death of Ferdinand the Catholic—all attacks on kings and ministers have sprung from Barcelona, and the awful atrocities of the Red Week of July, 1909, were perpetrated by the dregs of Catalonia

and the refuse of France, Italy, and Spain gathered together in the capital.

In the second quarter of the last century the Carlist War was the means of bringing further disunion into the ranks of the Spaniards, and unfortunately the name of the Catholic Church loomed largely in that parricidal conflict. The Carlist's ideal of what the Church should be in the Christian State is simply perfect: however, they were defeated in their first and second attempt to place Don Carlos on the throne. Since then they have never given a whole-hearted allegiance to the actual regime, and regard all those who do not belong to their ranks as only half-Catholics and enemies to the cause of the True Church. Señor Canalejas admitted in a recent speech that there are many Carlists and many Republicans in Spain, whom he dubbed revolutionaries of 'the Right' and of 'the Left.' No one can deny the respectability and talent of the Carlist party, nor its devotion to the Church; their enemies say they are more Catholic than the Pope; but many Catholics, who are not Carlists, doubt the wisdom of the Carlist programme for protecting the interests of the Church. The existence of the Carlist party is a misfortune for the monarch, because it deprives him and his government of the support of a large and highly respectable body of citizens; and it is a misfortune for the Church, at least *secundum quid*, for it divides her children into at least three hostile camps, each claiming to be her best friend.

Both the monarchial parties, namely, the Conservatives and the Liberals, are strongly attached to the actual regime, and regard the Carlists as their most bitter enemies because they are the strongest. As Catholics they deplore the fact that religion is made a party question, and hold that it loses more than it gains at the hands of the Carlists. The late Pope Leo XIII. advised all Spaniards to bury minor differences, and rally round the two supreme issues of Religion and Fatherland; but each one interpreted the advice according to his political programme, and no union was effected. The Carlists claim that the safety of the Church is due to themselves, and that long ago the mon-

archial parties—who are all Liberals of higher or lower degree in their eyes—would have crippled the Church by odious enactments, did they not fear to exhaust the patience of the Carlists, who are always prepared to take the field in defence of their religion. They believe that the best way to obey the Pope and serve Faith and Fatherland is to make the Carlist party as strong as possible. The Liberal party, at least, regards the religious Orders as the agents of Don Carlos—now of Don Jaime. I know many of the Orders would deny the reality of the supposition, but still the fact is as I have stated it. Furthermore, the religious Orders educate the vast majority of the better-class citizens in Spain, and are considered by the Liberals to inoculate them with their Carlist doctrines. On the other hand, the Republican party, mostly composed of professing atheists, is always clamouring for the suppression of the religious Orders, on the plea that they are a great burden on the country. Here we have two powerful motives to urge the head of a weak government to action : he strives to weaken his enemy by attacking the most peaceable and unresisting flank, and pacifies the most unruly portion of his own forces ; for, strange to say, the Republicans are almost the allies of the Liberals, who are the king's ministers !

Here, I believe, we have the genesis of the ' Lock-Law.' It is meant to injure the Carlist party, and to curry favour with the Republicans and the extreme section of the Liberal following. It may seem strange to some that I speak so naturally of the Republican party in a country with a king at its head and a constitutional government. Not merely are the Republicans strong in number, according to Señor Canalejas, but they have close on twenty members representing them in Parliament. The traditions of the party are violently anti-religious. After the abdication of King Amadeo, of the Savoy House, a Republic was set up in Spain, on September 29, 1873, and it was brought to an end on January 3, 1875, when Alfonso XII., son of the exiled Isabel, was re-instated in his mother's throne. On the advent of the Republic the masses entertained the wildest dreams of terrestrial happiness, implying total exemption from

taxes, etc. The chaotic rule of the Republicans commenced by dismissing the officers of the army, refusing to pay the stipends of the secular clergy, banishing the religious Orders, and seizing all available Church property. When the robbery ceased, through lack of plunder, the Republicans had to confess their inability to govern the country. It is not surprising that the Republican party of the present day, some of whom took an active part in those religious persecutions, should be the bitter enemies and constant maligners of the Catholic Church. The vast majority of the Republican following come from the lower classes, and are confined mainly to the large cities, Madrid, Barcelona, Saragossa, and Valencia. Some of them are mere speculative Republicans; they believe in the ideal only, and are called *republicanos de orden*. They have some excuse in a country where everyone finds fault with the government. The remainder are practical anarchists, and sympathise with that party. This is neatly expressed in a proverb one hears very frequently quoted: 'All the Republicans are not evil, but all evil-doers are Republicans.' In a country with a strong government, all opponents to the constitution would have been silenced; but in Spain the policy adopted all along is the weak one of conciliation, and so we find several Republicans, professors of the universities, officers in the army and navy, and in every department of official life, treated with the same impartiality as the most loyal of the citizens. This is quite in accordance with the unlimited liberty of conscience enjoyed by everyone in Spain, and yet the country is pilloried by our pious Protestant friends because they find Protestantism can make no headway in Spain. All Spaniards agree that no matter how careless their countrymen may be during life they nearly always die in peace with the Catholic Church, and never think of turning to another religion, except perhaps in times of stress, when they are paid for their attendance.

We are now in a position to enter on a closer study of the 'Lock-Law,' which is the most important of the anti-clerical measures originated by Señor Canalejas, and the first parliamentary measure of its kind passed by a Spanish

constitutional chamber. It is directed against the religious Orders, and before citing it I feel bound to discredit the myth that Spain is over-run with convents. In fact, it is all the other way. Spain has less religious houses than any of the European countries whose statistics I have seen. The numbers of the religious are found in a book, written by a Republican member of Parliament, Don Luis Morate, entitled, *Los Frailes en España*, and refer to the year 1904. Fresh statistics were available during the discussion of the 'Lock-Law,' and both agree substantially with the interesting information given by *Les Conférences* in its issue of June 30, 1910, viz. :—

Countries.	Census Year.	Catholic Population.	No. of Religious.	No. per 10,000.
Belgium . . .	1907	7,276,461	37,905	52
France . . .	1901	39,252,628	159,628	47
England and Wales . . .	1908	2,130,000	6,428	30
Germany . . .	1905	22,109,644	64,174	29
Ireland . . .	1908	3,308,661	9,190	27
Spain . . .	1907	19,742,285	50,670	26

The figures given recently in the Senate were 41,526 women and 12,801 men. The Sisters live in 1,829 convents, of which one-half are devoted to teaching and the remainder to charitable works. There are 597 communities of men, half of which are also devoted to teaching. The enemies of the Orders make great capital out of the fact that the religious Orders carry on industries; for instance, making chocolate, wines, etc.; and are exempt from the industrial taxes to which the ordinary manufacturer is liable, and hence can undersell the ordinary market. From the same statistics we learn that only eighteen convents are engaged in industries, and of these nine are devoted to the teaching of practical agriculture.

The second charge was flatly contradicted by the Bishop of Madrid, in the Senate, on October 29. He said: 'The religious Orders engaged in manufacturing are very few, and these do their work so well, *paying, naturally, the usual taxes, let their detractors say what they may*, that they deserve

not anathemas but the praise of all who are interested in the social welfare and prosperity.'

Just one word more, on the legal status of the religious Orders in Spain. Of course every establishment that is opened, and every public meeting that is held, must take steps, beforehand, to acquaint the civil governor and obtain his approval. But this is generally a matter of form; still, this was a means the Liberals had at hand to prevent the opening of new convents, if they wish to avail of it. But up to the present no constitutional government in Spain has tried to restrict the liberty of association: but when drawing up the last Concordat it was agreed between the Holy See and Spain that only three religious Orders would be entitled to receive a subsidy from the Budget of Public Worship. There was no difficulty in selecting two of the three Orders, namely, the Vincentians and the Order of St. Philip Neri. These fathers had kept clear of politics, and had no enemies. There was great competition between the remaining Orders, backed by their friends, for the third place, and the problem became so difficult that it was agreed to finish the Concordat, but postponed the naming of the third Order until some time later. It has never been named since! Probably different Orders have been appointed in the different dioceses by agreement between the bishops and the government.

This loose arrangement has given opportunities to the unscrupulous anti-clericals to say that all the religious houses in Spain are supported by the State, which is entirely untrue. The Bishop of Jaca contradicted this falsehood in the Senate. He said:—

The State does not maintain the Orders because by the Concordat it only undertook to support the Orders of St. Vincent and St. Philip Neri, and another Order, which has not yet been named, without 'doubt so that less might be paid, but it grants so little that it might be called nothing.

Now let us see the law which has been passed against those badly paid, unappreciated servants of the State. As

it consists of a single article it will not be tedious to give an accurate translation of it :—

A MEASURE APPROVED BY THE SENATE.

SINGLE ARTICLE.—No new Associations, belonging to the religious Orders or Congregations canonically recognized, shall be established without the authorization of the Minister of Grace and Justice, given in a royal decree, which shall be published in the *Madrid Gazette*, until such time as their juridical status shall have been definitely settled. Such authorization shall not be granted when more than the third part of the individuals, who are to form the new Association, are foreigners. If in the space of two years the new law of Associations shall not have been published the present law will become null and void.

THE PALACE OF THE SENATE,
November 3, 1910.

The meaning of the law requires no explanation: to feel its full force I have only to remind my readers of the avowal made by Señor Canalejas given above, that as long as he remains in power no permission will be given under any circumstances. Many brilliant speeches were delivered by members of the Episcopate and lay senators, interpreting nicely the teaching of Dogmatic Theology and Canon Law. They brought out the distinction between strictly ecclesiastical affairs and mixed questions, showing that, according to the Concordat, which has the same force as any other Spanish law, all those mixed questions should be debated between the representatives of the Holy See and Spain, and only after an agreement had been arrived at could legislation be commenced.

The Marquis of Pidal showed by a detailed description of the negotiations of both Liberals and Conservatives with the Vatican, that the Holy See was at all times most amenable to the reasonable requests of the ministers, and had even made sacrifices for the sake of peace. In 1901 the Holy See agreed that no new Order or Congregation (*not convents*) should be established without the consent of both parties, a concession which, according to Cardinal Rampolla,

had never been granted to any other Catholic State. Hence it was a surprise to everybody that when past experience of the Holy See gave every augury of a peaceable settlement, the Liberals should have approached the question in such a warlike attitude.

The distinguished Bishop of Jaca took part in the debate with his usual brilliancy, and exposed the hypocrisy of the Liberal government proposing such an *illiberal* law : it was illiberal, in so far as it has restricted the liberty of association, and odious, in so far as it was directed against a particular class of the community. He ridiculed the idea of the government occupying its time in counting the number of convents in Spain, when so much useful legislation was badly wanted ; and advised them to make an inquiry into the number of Freemason lodges, anarchist centres, and other houses *non sanctos*. Towards the end of his speech he made a very important statement :—

Catholics are indignant because they see that the least part of the evil is the law itself ; but the incalculable evil consists in the principle which is admitted, the outrage on reason, the rights of individuals and justice. They feel that it is but a trial of strength for future campaigns, in which the fate of the Church will be at stake.

Señor Canalejas replied personally to all the attacks on his darling project ; and it must be admitted that he reached a high level of oratory, and gave evidences of a profound culture. Still the net result of his brilliant outbursts of eloquence was the following two arguments : First, as it had been said that he had not the country at his back, he required this measure from the Senate, before he could resume negotiations with Rome, without lowering the prestige of the civil power and the prerogatives of the king ; secondly, the measure was necessary for the interior government of the country.

It is not easy to understand the force of the latter argument, except that he regards it as a matter of paramount importance to gratify his own friends, the Republicans, anarchists, *et hoc genus omne*. They are the only persons

who have caused religious disturbance in Spain by their unwarrantable attacks on religion. Let us now see what is the value of a vote from the Senate. Our people at home are mystified, when they hear that the majority of the people in one of these Latin countries is sincerely Catholic and at the same time their representatives are more or less anti-clerical. I will venture to give the explanation of it, not on my own authority, but on that of Señor Don Leopoldo Romeo, member of Parliament for Saragossa, and editor of *La Correspondencia*, one of the most important Madrid dailies. In a letter to his own journal, on November 29, combating the project of paying salaries to the members of Parliament, he wrote: 'Here the immense majority of the deputies are elected by a system of lottery (*cubilliteo*) with the sanction of the revolving parties, and *with the exception of three dozen, precisely those who are returned to Parliament by the votes of their electors*, the remainder go to the Congress' when some important question is being debated. I had often heard that the result of the general election was well known beforehand, but I was glad to see it stated authoritatively in black and white. At every general election many significant facts are *always* noticeable: when the party with a majority in Parliament resigns the opposition takes up the government of the country, replaces all the governors of the forty-nine provinces, the captain-generals of the military districts, most of the mayors, etc., and finally holds the election.

The party in power when the elections are held are *always* victorious, with a majority of about two to one; and so Liberals always follow Conservatives, and *vice versa*; for this reason, they are called *los partidos turnantes*. Each party expects the close co-operation of the other for the good of the Fatherland, and an ultimatum, at any time, from the opposition, that they are not prepared to continue the pact, suffices to terminate the life of a party in power. This is what happened in the Autumn of 1909, to Señor Maura. In the midst of torrents of abuse, which poured in on him from all the Freemason centres in the world, in consequence of the Ferrer execution, the leader of the

opposition, Señor Moret, declared in the Congress that the government should resign, and if not the Liberals would withdraw from the Chamber, and cease to co-operate in ruling the country. Maura resigned immediately; and so disciplined are his forces that no Conservative thought of forming a new Cabinet. Moret became head of a Liberal Cabinet, but the late Prime Minister declared war on him; with the result that he did not get permission to hold general elections, and had to resign in a short time, and Señor Canalejas took his place. He got the decree of dissolution immediately, ordered general elections, and returned to Parliament with a Conservative majority turned into a Liberal one. By far the most prominent politician in Spain is Señor Don Antonio Maura: he is the leader of the Conservatives, and the man whose word carries most weight with his countrymen. He spent twenty years in middle life in retirement from politics, and only returned when he felt that his country wanted him. He is a great admirer of the religious Orders, whatever he may think of their number and quality in Spain. Some years ago when a former Liberal government brought in an Association Law, almost entirely copied from France, Maura delivered a panegyric of the Orders, lasting four hours, which could be equalled by few, if any, ecclesiastical orators.

Still several papers stated recently that there was an understanding between the Conservatives and Liberals, to allow the 'Lock-Law' through the Senate: though Señor Canalejas afterwards denied the existence of any pact with the Conservatives. It is pretty certain that the Conservatives have a majority in the Senate, if they were all mustered. If the Conservatives connived at the passage of the law, their motives would not, I believe, be hostility to the Church, but (1) a belief that the evil arising from the law would not be great; (2) that they themselves will be in power soon, and can undo it, by giving the necessary permission; (3) it is only a temporary disposition, for two years at most; and (4) principally, according to the received *custom*, it is too soon for the Conservatives to return to power. There is no other Liberal combination if Canalejas

falls ; and as he is obsessed with the idea that he has first got to lock the door against any further religious Orders, the Royalist parties take him as he is, obsession and all ! My readers can now understand the force of the argument used by Señor Canalejas, when he threatened the Senate with resignation.

If this be the policy of the Conservatives it is a very risky one, and they make wake up some day to find that great evil has been done to their religion. ' Nothing succeeds like success, ' and they should not contribute to an anti-clerical campaign from the Liberal benches ; they should learn a lesson from France, where blatant hypocrisy declared that there were no hostile intentions towards the Church, and then followed the heartless persecution we have all witnessed. The Spanish people must exert themselves more in the field of politics ; they must vindicate the supreme power of the people, and deprive the politicians of the undue privileges they possess ; they must form a genuine representative body of legislators, and then give them loyal support ; they must work like brothers in this difficult task ; in a word, they must follow the advice of Leo XIII. : sink their minor differences, and rally round the supreme issues of Faith and Fatherland.

M. J. O'DOHERTY.

Notes and Queries

THEOLOGY

MASS IN PRIVATE AND SEMI-PUBLIC ORATORIES

REV. DEAR SIR,—Please say in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD: (1) Do the visitors staying in a mansion where there is a private oratory comply with the obligation of hearing Mass on Sunday? (2) Are the public allowed to hear Mass on Sundays in convent, workhouse, and asylum chapels?—Yours faithfully,

JUNIOR SACERDOS.

According to general Canon Law, a person can fully comply with the obligation of hearing Mass on Sundays or holidays by attending Mass in a church, a public oratory, or a semi-public oratory.¹ In regard to a private oratory, only those who are specially mentioned in the Indult can fulfil the obligation by assisting at Mass in the oratory. Indults vary in their terms, but usually those to whom the privilege of a private oratory is principally granted, their relations in consanguinity and affinity who are living with them, their noble guests, and servants whose service is required during the time of Mass, are given permission in the Indult to satisfy their obligation by hearing Mass in the private oratory.

Apart from the general regulations of Canon Law, in this country there is a custom which has come down from penal times, which never has been abrogated, and in virtue of which a person fulfils his obligation by assisting at Mass in any place.

Having made these preliminary remarks, I am in a position to reply to the questions proposed for solution.

(1) The terms of the Indult must be inspected in order to find out how far visitors are enabled to fulfil their obligation by hearing Mass in the private oratory. If the

¹ S. R. C., January 23, 1899.

Indult is of the kind already mentioned visitors who come under the designation of *hospites nobiles* have the privilege, and 'nobility' can be taken in a wide sense to include not only those who are noble by reason of family, but also those who are noble by reason of position in life. Certainly these enjoy the privilege if they are staying for some time with their host; and probably they enjoy it too if they are invited for the particular occasion.¹ Moreover, by reason of our local custom, any visitor can comply with his duty in this matter by assisting at Mass in the private oratory.

(2) Chapels of convents, workhouses, and asylums are semi-public oratories, since, though they are not established for the public at large, still they are not erected for the benefit of a private individual or a private family. Hence the obligation can be fulfilled by assisting at Mass in them on a Sunday or a Holiday of obligation.²

DISPARITAS CULTUS

REV. DEAR SIR,—A Catholic girl got married to an Anglican. A dispensation from the impediment of mixed religion was obtained, and all the prescribed conditions were faithfully carried out. Recently the husband became a Catholic, and, on investigation, it was found that his baptism was almost certainly invalid through the negligence of the minister. Was the marriage invalid on account of *disparitas cultus*?

S.

According to the rules of the Holy Office, there is a presumption of law in favour of the validity of the baptism of a person who belongs to a sect such as the Anglican Church, which prescribes baptism with its essential matter and form. There is consequently a presumption of law

¹ Lehmkühl, *Theol. Mor.*, i., editio undecima, n. 721.

² 'Hujus generis [semi-publica] oratoria sunt, quae pertinent ad pia Instituta et Societates votorum simplicium aliasque Communitates sub regula sive statutis saltem ab Ordinario approbatis; ad domus spirituales exercitiis addictas; ad convictus et hospitia juventuti litteris, scientiis aut artibus instituendae destinata; ad nosocomia, orphanotrophia, necnon ad arces et carceres; atque similia oratoria, in quibus ex instituto aliquis Christifidelium coetus convenire solet ad audiendam Missam. Quibus adjungi debent capellae in coemeterio rite erectae, dummodo in Missae celebratione non iis tantum, ad quos pertinet, sed aliis etiam fidelibus aditus patet' (S. R. C., January 23, 1899).

that no diriment impediment existed in the case presented for solution. This would have been true even if, at the time of contracting marriage, a doubt existed about the validity of the baptism, and *a fortiori* it would have been true if the baptism were then regarded as certainly valid.

If after the celebration of the marriage it is found out with certainty that the baptism was invalid, the person must be baptized again, but the marriage was valid because of the presumption of law which had the effect of inducing the Church not to urge its impediment of disparity or worship, or at least of granting conditionally a dispensation from the diriment impediment. This teaching is certainly true when the Church intervened in the celebration of the marriage by granting a dispensation from the impedient impediment of mixed religion. The doctrine is probably true when the Church did not grant the dispensation from mixed religion. In this latter case, strictly speaking, the marriage can be regarded as valid and the parties can be allowed to live as man and wife, provided, of course, that no other diriment impediment such as clandestinity invalidated the marriage. It is recommended, however, for the sake of security, to go through the ceremony of revalidating the marriage after the conferring of baptism on the convert.¹

DOES A COINER SIN AGAINST STRICT JUSTICE ?

REV. DEAR SIR,—A certain astute person in this district has been in the habit of coining half-crowns. The material employed is just as good as the material used in the Government mint, and it is exceedingly difficult to detect the fraud. Was the coiner guilty of a sin against strict justice ?

L.

In the case of coined silver the intrinsic value of the material is much less than the value of the coin, and the Government is responsible to the public for this difference in value. When, then, a coiner forges a silver coin he imposes on the Government a financial responsibility, or he

¹ Cf. Lehmkühl, *Theol. Mor.*, vol. ii. n. 985 ; Tanquerey, *De Matrimonio*, n. 370.

deprives the possessors of the coin of any guarantee that will cover the difference above mentioned. In either case his action is the efficacious cause of injury, and he, consequently, sins against strict justice.

PUBLIC PROPRIETY

REV. DEAR SIR,—You would very much oblige by giving your opinion on the following question in an early number of your esteemed I. E. RECORD:—

George enters into formal espousals with Bertha, who is, unknown to him, in an advanced stage of consumption (or gravely affected with phthisis). George afterwards becoming aware of this fact backs out of the engagement, and wants to become engaged to Veronica, Bertha's sister. He maintains that he is perfectly free to form a new engagement on the ground that his engagement with Bertha was invalid, for this reason, namely, that a consent which is given in error is no true consent. He cannot believe that God would hold him bound by such a consent. And apart from that, the espousals in the case are certainly rescindable, and an obligation, rescindable at pleasure, is no obligation.

When espousals are duly dissolved are the effects also dissolved?

SUBSCRIBER.

The espousals between George and Bertha were valid, but rescindable. The error in the case was not substantial, just as a similar error in contracting marriage would not be substantial. Hence the espousals were not invalid. The case would have been different if the absence of phthisis were made a *conditio sine qua non* of the contract, but there is no indication that such a condition was present.

Though valid the espousals were rescindable at the will of George. Any serious physical deterioration, either supervening or subsequently detected, suffices to permit a withdrawal. Nor can it be stated with accuracy that an obligation rescindable at pleasure is no obligation, because until the obligation is actually rescinded it remains in force, with the natural and juridical effects which such an obligation entails.

The impeding matrimonial impediment which arises

from valid espousals ceases when the obligation attached to the espousals ceases, but the diriment impediment remains in force until it is removed by a dispensation.

It follows that though George can lawfully rescind the espousals which he contracted with Bertha, he cannot validly marry Veronica until he has obtained a dispensation from the diriment impediment of public propriety arising from valid espousals. In virtue of powers granted in the Formula VI. our Bishops can concede this dispensation: 'Dispensandi super impedimento publicae honestatis justis ex sponsalibus proveniente.'

**SIGNIFICANT OMISSION AND GRAVE MISREPRESENTATION
BY THE ANONYMOUS WRITER OF THE 'TABLET'**

The following reply to my criticism of the letter of 'Noli esse justus multum' appeared in the *Tablet*, December 17, 1910:—

In the current number of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* Dr. Harty quotes my first letter to the *Tablet*, and then says that both my logic and my theology are hopelessly at fault. He attempts to show that my logic is faulty in this way: 'The law of the land and the travelling public do not accept *all* the terms of the railway company; therefore they do not accept *this* particular condition! Where did "Noli esse justus multum" learn logic?'

Pace Dr. Harty, the argument is perfectly logical. He asserted that 'Not transferable' was a necessary condition of the contract. Why? Because those words are printed on the tickets. If I can show that the printing of certain words on the tickets does not make them necessary terms of the contract, I destroy the ground of his argument. To do this it is sufficient to show that the mere printing of a condition on the ticket does not make it a term of the contract; and this is shown if there is one condition printed on the ticket which is not a term of the contract. It is not necessary to enumerate all the conditions and prove that none of them are necessary terms of the contract. To put the matter in syllogistic form, Dr. Harty's argument would run thus: All conditions that are printed on the tickets are terms of the contract; but 'Not transferable' is printed on the ticket, therefore 'Not transferable' is a term of the contract.

I denied the major, and asserted that there are some conditions printed on the tickets which neither the law of the land nor the travelling public accept as terms of the contract. Having denied the major, I can logically deny the conclusion. I venture to think that my logic is sound and my theology as well.

NOLI ESSE JUSTUS MULTUM.

My readers will note with surprise that 'Noli esse justus multum' has made no attempt to reply to the theological and legal parts of my criticism, and they are able to draw their own conclusion.

Driven from the field in theology and law, he tries to save his logic by grossly misrepresenting my argument. To make his misrepresentation quite evident it is sufficient to give side by side the syllogism which he attributes to me and the argument which I actually employed in the November and December numbers of the I. E. RECORD :—

ALLEGED ARGUMENT.

All conditions that are printed on the tickets are terms of the contract.

But 'not transferable' is printed on the ticket.

Therefore, 'not transferable' is a condition of the contract.

ACTUAL ARGUMENT.

All *reasonable* conditions of the contract, imposed by the railway company, are binding in justice.

But the 'not transferable' condition of the contract, imposed by the railway company, is *reasonable*, as is proved by the estimation of sensible men who recognize the fairness of charging less for a double journey than for two single journeys, and by the law of the land which declares that the user of the transferred ticket has not paid the just fare.

Therefore, 'not transferable' is binding in justice.¹

In taking leave of 'Noli esse justus multum,' I beg to

¹ Cf. I. E. RECORD, Nov., pp. 496, 497; Dec., pp. 632, 633.

offer him my sincere thanks for the opportunity which he gave me, and which enabled me to prove beyond question the truth of the opinion which I expressed in the November number of the I. E. RECORD.

J. M. HARTY.

CANON LAW

ENDOWMENTS: ADMINISTRATION OF ECCLESIASTICAL PROPERTY

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly oblige by explaining the Church's legislation respecting endowments? It will help you to elucidate the points upon which I seek information if I suggest the following hypothetical case:—

N, a struggling mission in a suburban district, is sufficiently endowed by a generous benefactor to yield an annual income of £100. Now the chancellor of the diocese, regardless of the incumbent, invests the endowment, and causes a loss to the mission of £50 a year, so that in ten years the mission is poorer by £500.

I have always understood that according to Canon Law an endowment must be handed down intact to each successive incumbent. But if an *economus* can invest moneys so bequeathed *ad libitum*, what security is there for an endowment? If by bad speculation he can lose a part of the endowment he can lose the whole. Hence arises the question: How are endowments safeguarded by Canon Law? If endowments are invested by the chancellor of a diocese is it not *at the risk of the diocese*? I cannot see that a bequest to a particular mission can become the property of the diocese unless a diocese is run on socialistic lines.

PAROCHUS.

Our correspondent is quite correct in stating that the intention of the Church is that endowments should be preserved intact and handed down undiminished. For that purpose various regulations have been adopted. It is a well-known rule of Canon Law, confirmed by various decisions, that money belonging to the Church is to be invested in real property that yields a secure income without en-

tailing any risk of the capital. Investments in company shares are looked upon with suspicion, and are allowed only when the income so derived is merely supplementary or when there is no opportunity of turning the money to better account.¹ And for the same reason, though the Church protests against civil laws that tend to limit her freedom in dealing with her property, administrators are admonished of their obligation to comply with such laws when their neglect would be likely to lead to loss or to frustrate the end the donors originally intended.²

And it is with a view to the same end that the Church has taken away the exclusive right of administration of ecclesiastical property from clerics of inferior rank and given the Bishops the right of general supervision. However good the intentions of the actual owners of ecclesiastical property, the exercise of an uncontrolled and independent right of administration would often, in practice, be against the best interests of the Church. Hence, except where Church property has by special law been withdrawn from the Bishop's control, as it is, for instance, in the case of exempt orders of men³ or of the more recent congregations of women,⁴ the Bishop has a right of administration in regard to all ecclesiastical property in his diocese. In some documents he is referred to as 'tutor' rather than 'administrator'; but in practice it comes to the same thing.⁵ His power is to be exercised according to the prescriptions of Canon Law. And where there is no distinct law on a particular point, his own authority takes the place of law and the matter is to be decided in his favour.⁶

As illustrating these general principles we may instance the decree of the Council of Trent, according to which the Bishop is executor of all pious bequests in cases allowed by

¹ 'In bonis stabilibus et tutis et frugiferis.' Wernz, *Jus Decret.* iii. 153. Trombetta, *Praxeos regulae*, pp. 171 sqq.

² Cf. Ojetti, *Synop. Rev. Mor.* (new edition), p. 101.

³ Conc. Trid., Sess. vii. c. 15. *Collect. S.C. Prop. Fid.* n. 1623.

⁴ S.C. Ep. et Reg. March 27, 1896. Cf. Const. *Conditae a Christo*, 1900.

⁵ *Acta Apos. Sed.*, vol. xxviii. p. 140 sqq. (April 27, 1895).

⁶ Cf. Const. *Romanos Pontifices* (Leo XIII., May, 1881), *Acta Apos. Sed.*, vol. xiii. p. 481.

Canon Law, and is to enjoy extensive administrative faculties in all ecclesiastical matters pertaining to his diocese :—

Episcopi, etiam tanquam Sedis Apostolicae delegati, in casibus a jure concessis, omnium piarum dispositionum, tam in ultima voluntate quam inter vivos, sint executores: habeant jus visitandi hospitalia, collegia quaecumque, ac confraternitates laicorum . . . elemosynas Montis Pietatis sive charitatis, et loca pia omnia, quomodocumque nuncupentur, etiamsi praedictorum locorum cura ad laicos pertineat . . . ac omnia quae ad Dei cultum, aut animarum salutem, seu pauperes sustentandos instituta sunt, ipsi ex officio suo, juxta sacrorum canonum statuta cognoscant et exsequantur, non obstantibus quacumque consuetudine, etiam immemorabili, privilegio aut statuto.¹

Even in cases in which Bishops are expressly excluded by the testator or by the rules of the foundation itself from revising the records of administration, they may compel the administrators to furnish an account; may act as administrators themselves if those appointed are negligent in discharging their duties; and may remove the latter from the administration, even when the testator expressly willed that the bequest would be null and void if the Bishop should interfere in the matter or insist on getting an account of the manner in which the money was spent.² Stipulations of the latter kind are regarded in the same light as immoral conditions in contracts: the will as a whole is valid but the particular clause is treated as non-existent. The Bishop may, moreover, decree, either in the diocesan synod or outside it, that the executors are not to incur expenses beyond a certain amount without the consent of the parties interested in the due fulfilment of the testator's wishes, or without the consent of the Bishop himself.³ And though he has no power to apply the funds to purposes other than what the donor desired, he has extensive powers of interpretation, and may go further

¹ Sess. xxii. c. 8 (*de ref.*).

² c. 17 *de test.*, x. iii. 26; c. *un. de test.* (iii. 6) in *Clem.*, S. C. C., December 10, 1695.

³ Cf. Lucidi, *De vis. sacr. lim.*, c. 7, n. 268 S. C. C., January 21, 1786.

still when the circumstances demand, as is clear from another decree of Trent :—

Episcopi, tanquam Sedis apostolicæ delegati, transferre possint beneficia simplicia etiam jurispatronatus ex ecclesiis . . . in matrices seu alias ecclesias locorum eorundem seu viciniorum arbitrio suo : atque in iisdem ecclesiis erigant altaria vel cappellas sub iisdem invocationibus vel in iam erecta altaria vel cappellas transferant cum omnibus emolumentis et oneribus prioribus ecclesiis impositis.¹

He may apply to any pious use he pleases the revenue of ecclesiastical property not bound up by the donor for any special purpose, or whatever remains of a bequest when the purpose intended by the testator has been fully carried out.

All of which, of course, does not mean that he becomes the owner of such property. Strange theories have been held by canonists in the matter, but it is abundantly clear that the property belongs not to the Church in general, nor to the Roman Pontiff, nor to the Bishop, but to the particular church or institution or ecclesiastical person to whom it has been bequeathed.² ‘Conclude, igitur, hæc omnia esse sub manu episcopi, et ad illius dispensationem pertinere ; non quidem ut ad episcopum spectet dominium reddituum . . . sed ut illorum redditus curet expendendos in usus ad quos sunt deputati.’³ Though the Bishop may take over the administration, the revenue that results belongs to the person for whom he acts.

And as administration is to a certain extent a corollary of ownership, it follows that the lower clergy may also be administrators, but, unless an exception be proved as above in particular cases, always in subordination to the Ordinary.⁴ They are appointed by him and may be removed by him also, or suspended from Office.⁵ They are

¹ Sess. xxi. 7.

² Cf. c. I *de test.*, iii. 26, Conc. Trid., Sess. xxv. c. 3, *de requil.*, Sess. xxii. c. 12 (*de ref.*).

³ Fagnanus, in c. 3, *de relig. dom.*, n. 7, *Acta Apos. Sed.*, ii. 373.

⁴ Cf. Wernz, *Jus. Decr.*, n. 131, S. C. De Prop. Fid., *ad Epis. Bardst.* (April 1, 1816).

⁵ Ferraris, *Prompta Bibl.*, ‘*administratio*’; Bouix, *De Epis.*, p. 308, etc.

bound, as we have seen, to render an account yearly of their discharge of duty, no matter what custom, even immemorial, there may be to the contrary, and the Bishop may even exact an oath that their duties will be performed as well as their ability allows.¹ Their position and obligations are summed up in the apostolic letter of Pius VII. to the Bishops of North America on August 24, 1822 :—

Memorare debent aeditui, bona, quae ad divinum cultum necnon ad ecclesiae ejusque ministrorum sustentationem oblata sunt, in ecclesiae potestatem transire : sicut autem episcopi ex ordinatione divina sunt, qui praesunt ecclesiae, ita ipsi non possint ab eorumdem bonorum cura, dispositione et vigilantia excludi. Quare sacra Tridentina Synodus expresse mandavit administratores fabricae cuiusve ecclesiae, etiam cathedralis, et quorumcumque piorum locorum singulis annis ad reddendam Ordinario rationem administrationis teneri, addens quod etiamsi ex praecipua aliqua loci constitutione administrationis ratio reddenda sit aliis ad id deputatis, tamen cum iis adhibendus sit etiam Ordinarius. Quare si aeditui concordi animo cum episcopo temporalia administraverint, omnia pacifice et secundum ordinem fient.

Our correspondent does not state whether in the will the money was left to the Bishop, or chancellor, or incumbent. If to the Bishop or chancellor, we do not see that any difficulty can arise : the trust should be faithfully administered by the one or by the other, and the incumbent has nothing to do with it except to take the revenue that it produces. If to the incumbent, then the administration would naturally fall to him also ; but, as is clear from all we have said, the Bishop is in part executor, no matter how the provisions of the will may have been worded to exclude him, and may, if there be sufficient reason to warrant such a course, take the whole matter into his own hands or carry out the administration through his delegate. On the state of things which led to the chancellor's assumption of the administration, ' Parochus ' has, unfortunately, given us little or no information.

Of course, if the administrator, whoever he be, is guilty

¹ c. 2, *de rel. dom. in Clem.* (iii. 11), *Conc. Trid.*, Sess. xxii. c. 9.

of grave and culpable neglect in the discharge of his duties, he is bound to make good from his own resources the loss the Church has suffered.¹ It is, after all, only an application of the general principles of justice. The Canon Law is very favourable to churches or religious institutions in circumstances of the kind. They are regarded as 'minors,' and have a right to assert their claim even when the time has elapsed that would be fatal to an appeal in ordinary judicial cases—they enjoy, in other words, the canonical privilege known as 'reinstatement' or 'restitutio in integrum.'² But it cannot be said that the chancellor undertakes the work of administration 'at the expense of the diocese': it is not the diocese but the individual himself that is responsible. If the funds administered belonged to the diocese, instead of to the parish, it would not be the diocese but the chancellor himself that should bear the loss. Just as if the parish priest administered the funds, it would be at his own risk and not at that of his church: the parish would have a claim in justice against him if it suffered loss through grossly culpable maladministration on his part.

And when it is stated that endowments are to be handed down intact, the meaning is not that the result has to be attained in all possible circumstances, but that it should be secured as far as ordinary human ability and foresight admit. Financial success is very uncertain. Even when everything is done for the best, things will happen that are beyond the control of the ablest administrator. And when they do occur, their victim must bear them in a philosophic spirit and try to be content, even though what he hands down to his successor is considerably less than what his predecessor left him.

NO MAN A JUDGE IN HIS OWN CASE

REV. DEAR SIR,—Might I ask your opinion on a matter that has come under my notice? A friend of mine has been accused, I believe unjustly, of certain offences. To his astonishment he

¹ S. C. C., in *Haban.* (August 24, 1894).

² c. 1, ^o*de restit. in integ. in 6°* (i. 21); c. 1, 3, *de in integ. rest.*, x. (i. 41)

finds that the person he is supposed to have injured is to occupy a prominent place in the committee of enquiry that is to try him. He has lodged a formal protest, but is not very confident that it will get a favourable hearing, if indeed any at all. Has he sufficient grounds for an appeal, if the decision goes against him ?

R. S.

It is a principle of the natural law, which holds good in every country whether Canon Law has been fully established there or not, that no one should be a judge in his own case. Human nature is not so perfect as to justify us in supposing that, when a man's own interests are concerned, the scales will always be held with strict impartiality. Individuals may, it is true, be quite as strict in dealing with themselves as with others, or even more so ; still any system which would allow such a practice in the administration of justice would be rightly looked upon with grave suspicion. The defendant in the case before us is, therefore, perfectly justified in taking exception to the composition of the tribunal that is to try his case. The right of taking such exception is one of the strongest and most legitimate weapons of defence, and the accused, who, according to all laws, should have the benefit of the doubt, should be allowed it in the fullest measure possible. It is a favour, and should, therefore, be given a liberal interpretation : it is for the common good, and should, therefore, be extended to the farthest limits the claims of law and justice will allow.

None of the exceptions, real or apparent, to the general principle have any application to the present case. Canonists maintain that the supreme judge, whether in Church or State, may determine an issue in which he is himself concerned¹ : that a Bishop or other superior may adjudicate, when the interests concerned are not so much his own as those of his church, or when the extent of his jurisdiction is called in question² : and that, finally, the general principle is not to be urged when the facts of the case are so

¹ *Cum venissent*, 12 ; *De judiciis* ; Schmalzg., *De jud.*, n. 18.

² *Ibid.* n. 19.

notorious that the justice of the sentence is patent to everyone. None of these apply to the present instance.

When an exception of this kind is taken, the first duty of the tribunal is to secure a definite decision on its merits. Several methods may be adopted, and have been adopted in different countries. Sometimes the Bishop decides, provided, of course, his own qualifications are not called in question; sometimes the matter is left to a committee appointed by both parties: or the difficulty may be got over by having the challenged party retire for that particular case, provided that the number still remaining be sufficient, according to the particular law of the country, to decide the main issue.¹ But if the trial is to be conducted on canonical lines, some method of the kind *must* be adopted; and if, as our correspondent thinks likely in the present instance, no notice be taken of a reasonable protest, the defendant is justified in appealing against the threatened sentence and having recourse to a higher tribunal.

He may, if he pleases, lodge a 'complaint of nullity.' It will implicitly contain an appeal, and will hold good, therefore, if the judge of appeal decides that the proceedings in the lower court were valid. If the complaint is admitted and decided in his favour, he will be restored to the same position he was in before the case was first heard. If it is not admitted, or decided against him, the supreme judge will act on the implied appeal, and, taking cognizance of the facts of the original case as well as of the character of the first trial, will confirm, modify, or revoke the sentence as justice demands.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

¹ For fuller details consult, e.g., Smith, *Elements of Ecc. Law*, vol. ii. p. 202 sqq., on the working of the Committees of Investigation in the United States.

LITURGY

PRIVILEGED REQUIEM MASSES IN NOVEMBER.
COVERING OF SCAPULARS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you please kindly answer the following questions in an early number of the I. E. RECORD, and oblige :—

(1) There is a cemetery attached to the church of which I am curate. It is the custom to have an annual Solemn Requiem Mass every November for the repose of the souls of those buried therein. Does such a Mass enjoy any privilege? May it be said on a Double, e.g., on the Feast of St. Gertrude?

(2) Is it true that covers on Scapulars render the indulgence null and void? Or, in other words, can covered Scapulars be indulgenced?

SUBSCRIBER.

(1) There is a decree by the Congregation of Rites in regard to November Requiem Masses, but in order to enjoy any privilege they must be celebrated within the Octave of the Commemoration of All Souls. In this case they are then regarded as Anniversaries in the wide sense and may be celebrated on *Doubles Minor* and days of lesser liturgical importance. Being restricted to the Octave,¹ and not enjoying any privilege outside it, they cannot be celebrated on the Feast of St. Gertrude, which falls on November 15. Within the Octave they are entitled to be celebrated *per modum duplicis ritus*, that is, with only one prayer. It is assumed that the Masses are either Solemn or *Cantatae*. Else they do not enjoy any privilege whatever beyond the *Missae Quotidianae*.

(2) A distinction must be made between adjustable covers and those that are so arranged as to form an essential part of the Scapular. The little Scapular must be of wool. Now if a piece of cotton or silk is sewed over it so as to conceal the essential parts (as the material, form, and colour), this would seem to be against a decree of the Congregation of Indulgences, dated June 18, 1898, and to render the Scapular invalid. Similarly, if a Brown Scapular be so

¹ Cong. of Rites, 28 April, 1902.

elaborately embroidered with ornamentation on both sides that its colour is not visible, this would also make it in all probability invalid. It is a different thing when a cover or case is added as an accidental appendage to a Scapular complete in itself and exhibiting all the qualities of matter, form, and colour that are prescribed.¹

COLOURED UNDERGROUND ON ALB SLEEVES AND FRINGES

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly inform me as to the following question: Has an ordinary parish priest the right to wear an alb with red lining behind the flounce or cuffs of the alb?

In discussing the matter I took the negative. Am I right or wrong? *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, under the word 'alb,' says that a decree of July, 1892, sanctioned the practice of having coloured lining behind the flounce or cuffs of the alb. If you answer through the I. E. RECORD, please do not mention my name.—Yours respectfully in Christ,

SACERDOS.

Relative to the matter of this query two points were raised before the Congregation of Rites. The first was put on 12 July, 1892: 'Num tolerari potest, ut fundus coloratus supponatur textili denticulato vel operi phrygio in manicis vel fimbriis Albarum, necnon in manicis rochetti?' To which the reply was: 'Quoad manicas et fimbrias Albarum, affirmative; quoad manicas autem in rochettiis, fundum esse posse coloris vestis talaris relativae dignitatis.'

The second doubt was proposed on November 24, 1899, as follows: 'An toleranda consuetudo utendi fundo caerulei coloris sub velo translucenti in fimbriis et manicis Albarum?' The answer to this was: 'Affirmative: et detur decretum 12 July, 1892.'

Apart from the rochet there is question in these two decrees of the propriety of a coloured underground or foil on the sleeves, and on the lower border or fringe, of the Alb, so that these parts, being of some transparent material, such

¹ Cf. Ulrich, *Tresor Spirituel*, p. 121; Beringer, *Les Indulgences*, i. p. 536.

as lace, the background would be distinctly visible. The answer that the custom might be *tolerated* implies that the use of this coloured background is clearly against the spirit of the Rubrics, and that it should not be introduced wherever it does not already exist. My correspondent, therefore, in denying the right of a parish priest to this ornamental appendage had much justice on his side. The only concession he was bound to make to his adversary was that, if customary, then the parish priest, or any other priest, might enjoy the tolerated usage.

In these countries the coloured underground is common enough on the sleeves, but rather rare on the borders, of albs. There is often, indeed, a very large fringe of lace, but nothing more. Van der Stappen¹ says the background on the bottom of the alb is unknown in Belgium, and he hopes no simple priest will ever venture to introduce an ornament that belongs by right only to dignitaries.

The desirability for the background was felt when lace came to be employed upon the sleeves and borders of the alb. To prevent the black soutane from showing through the transparent embroidery the underground was employed. Where it is properly used, as in the case of dignitaries, its colour should, strictly speaking, correspond to that which the individual is entitled to wear in his ceremonial dress.

**USE OF PRIE-DIEU AT BENEDICTION AND CHAIR IN
PREACHING. PRAYERS IN 'MISSA QUOTIDIANA' AND
FORM FOR GIVING HOLY COMMUNION**

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly answer the following in next issue of I. E. RECORD:—

(1) May a parish priest or curate who are in poor health preach to the people from a chair on the altar step?

(2) Is it allowable for them to use a prie-dieu when saying the Rosary in presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed?

(3) In giving Holy Communion should the form 'Corpus Domini,' etc., be said in an audible tone?

(4) In *Missa Quotidiana* which is the first prayer to be said?

(5) In a church where the Blessed Sacrament is kept can a

¹ *De Celebratione Missae*, p. 155.

priest read his Office and recreate himself by walking up and down nave or aisles?

DUBIUS.

(1) The inconveniences arising from adopting the course suggested in this query are so great that it would appear better to dispense with the sermon altogether rather than preach under such strange and unusual circumstances. The priest who does not feel equal to the physical exertion of saying a few words to the people after Mass in the recognized way might regard himself as exempt from the obligation altogether. And if he had any doubts on the matter himself these would in all probability be laid to rest if only the situation was explained in the proper quarter. There would not be so much difficulty about addressing the congregation from a chair placed in the pulpit or at the sanctuary rail, but in addition to being a usurpation of an episcopal privilege it would excite a good deal of comment if the preacher were to sit in a chair on the predella. The ordinary altar-steps, which are only about twelve inches wide, do not seem capable of easily accommodating a seat. Then, too, during the functions which a Bishop performs while sitting on the faldstool on the altar, the Blessed Sacrament is not supposed to be in the Tabernacle.

(2) The officiant at Benediction kneels on the first step of the altar during the entire function. It is, therefore, not proper to use a *prie-dieu* as a matter of course. In exceptional cases, however, the use of the kneeler might be permitted a delicate priest who is not able for the strain of kneeling for a considerable time without some support. In this hypothesis the cope need not be assumed until the officiant is about to go up to the predella to give the blessing with the Blessed Sacrament.

(3) Rubricists say that the formula for the distribution of Holy Communion should be said *clara voce*, that is, in a tone of voice that will be audible to those at least in the immediate vicinity of the celebrant.

(4) The order of the prayers for these Masses has been regulated by a decree of the Congregation of Rites, dated June 30, 1896. The rule is that the first prayer should be

that which, of those given in the Missal for Requiem Masses, is most appropriate to the quality of the person or persons for whom the Mass is offered. This assumes that these persons are known to the celebrant. Should this not be so, then the first prayer given in the Missal for the *Missa Quotidiana* is to be taken. The last prayer is always the *Fidelium Deus*, and the intermediate prayer or prayers may be selected, according to the wishes of the celebrant, from those in the Missal for Dead Masses.

(5) There is very little, if any, irreverence in reading one's Office once in a while walking up and down one of the aisles. The same would not be true of the nave, as in this case the priest should necessarily turn his back frequently upon the altar. Neither would it be free from all impropriety if a priest were to make a *habit* of reading his Office regularly in this fashion in any part of a church that is either blessed or consecrated.

SABBATINE INDULGENCE

REV. DEAR SIR,—On page 643 of December issue there is a reference to the 'Sabbatine Indulgence.' I thought this fable was exploded; see pages 334 (vol. xv., 1904) and 74 and 355 (vol. xvi., 1904)

The legend of the origin of the Brown Scapular may not stand the test of the iconoclastic criticism which Father Thurston has ably brought to bear upon many popular devotions and practices, but it is true to say that the Sabbatine privilege is still 'piously believed' in by the faithful generally. This is all that was claimed for it in the passage cited from the I. E. RECORD. Further, the Congregation of Rites has encouraged and continues to encourage, apparently, this pious belief. Now, this being so, it was quite fair to use this fact as an *argumentum ad hominem* when seeking some explanation of the difficulties arising from the recent action of the Congregation in sanctioning the substitution of Medals for Scapulars.

P. MORRISROE.

DOCUMENTS

THE OATH OF A DOCTOR IN SACRED SCRIPTURE

MOTU PROPRIO

DE IUREIURANDO CONCEPTIS VERBIS DANDO AB IIS QUI DOCTORES
IN SACRA SCRIPTURA SUNT RENUNTIANDI

Illibatae custodiendae Religionis Nostrae doctrinae animum intendentes, plura superioribus annis providenda ac sancienda curavimus quorum virtute, Decessoris Nostri fel. rec. exempla secuti, tum debitum responsis Sacri Consilii de Re Biblica obsequium firmavimus, tum proprium huiusmodi colendis studiis, aetate hac nostra quam quae maxime gravibus, Institutum condidimus. Quoniam vero non id tantummodo Cordi Nobis est alumnos, ad magisterium contendentes, praesidiis disciplinae consentaneis ita instruere ut scientiam de Re Biblica perfecte calleant et progressionem finitimarum doctrinarum in Sacros libros defendendos apte derivent, sed etiam ut, magisterium assequuti, haustam disciplinam fideliter tradant, scientiamque in discipulorum mentibus sine ulla devii sensus suspicione inserant, idcirco formulam praeterea iurisiurandi praescribendam putavimus, quam candidati ad lauream, antequam Doctoris titulo in Sacra Scriptura donentur, recitare atque emittere teneantur. Itaque, tum doctrinae Sacrae, tum Magistrorum alumnorumque, tum denique Ecclesiae ipsius securiori bono prospecturi, motu proprio atque ex certa scientia et matura deliberatione, deque Apostolicae Nostrae potestatis plenitudine, praesentium vi, perpetuumque in modum, decernimus, volumus, praecipimus, ut, qui in Sacra Scriptura Doctores sint renuntiandi, iuramenti formulam in hunc, qui sequitur, modum emittant :

‘ Ego N. N. omni qua par est reverentia me subiicio et sincero animo adhaereo omnibus decisionibus, declarationibus et praescriptionibus Apostolicae Sedis seu Romanorum Pontificum de Sacris Scripturis deque recta earumdem explanandarum ratione, praesertim vero Leonis XIII Litteris encyclicis *Providentissimus Deus* die XVIII Novembris anno MDCCCXIII datis, nec non Pii X Motu proprio *Praestantia Scripturae Sacrae* dato die XVIII Novembris anno MDCCCXVII, eiusque Apostolicis

Litteris *Vineae electae*, datis die VII Maii anno MDCCCXCIX, quibus edicitur “ universos omnes conscientiae obstringi officio sententiis Pontificalis Consilii de Re Biblica, ad doctrinam pertinentibus, sive quae adhuc sunt emissae, sive quae posthac edentur, perinde ac decretis Sacrarum Congregationum a Pontifice probatis, se subiiciendi; nec posse notam tum detrectatae obedientiae tum temeritatis devitare aut culpa propterea vacare gravi quotquot verbis scriptisque sententias has tales impugnent;” quare spondeo me “ principia et decreta per Sedem Apostolicam et pontificiam Biblicam Commissionem edita vel edenda ” uti “ supremam studiorum normam et regulam ” fideliter, integre sincereque servaturum et inviolabiliter custoditurum, nec unquam me sive in docendo sive quomodolibet verbis scriptisque eadem esse impugnaturum. Sic spondeo. sic iuro. sic me Deus adiuvet et haec sancta Dei Evangelia.

Quod vero, documento hoc Nostro, Motu proprio edito, statutum est, id ratum firmiterque esse iubemus, contrariis quibuscumque minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die XXIX Iunii MCMX, Pontificatus Nostri anno septimo.

PIUS PP. X.

THE NEW DIOCESE OF SIMLA

ACTA PII PP. X

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

ERIGITUR NOVA ARCHIDIOECESIS SIMLENSIS (SIMLA) IN INDIIS ORIENTALIBUS

PIUS PP. X

Ad futuram rei memoriam.—Incensum, quod Nos urget, studium Christi regnum in terris propagandi, admonet Nos, ut quum in aliqua regione auctus fidelium numerus tum Episcoporum muneribus, tum ipsius gregis utilitati officere videatur, mutatis eorundem locorum condicionibus quam maxime prospiciamus. Cum vero inter ingentem hominum multitudinem, qui septentrionalem tractum Indiarum Orientalium incolunt, Christifideles, adiuvante Domino, non intermisisse succrescant, cumque plaris intersit eos quotidie magis augeri ac multiplicari; Nos, de consilio etiam Venerabilium Fratrum Nostrorum S. R. E. Cardinalium S. Congregationi Christiano nomini propagando

praepositorum, novam ibi Metropolitanam Sedem erigendam censuimus. Quare ex certa scientia ac matura deliberatione Nostris, deque Apostolicae potestatis Nostrae plenitudine, praesentium vi, motu proprio, aliquot districtus ab archidioecesi Agraensi et aliquot a dioecesi Lahorensi seiungimus ac dismembramus, eosque in archidioecesim, cuius sedem in urbe Simla positam volumus, dilata sententia quod ad eius suffraganeas ecclesias, erigimus et constituimus. Praeterea novam huiusmodi archidioecesim apostolicis curis Ordinis Fratrum Minorum Capulatorum libenti animo concedimus, quippe qui de catholica Religione inter Indos proferenda optime assidueque mereantur. Denique votis sive dilecti filii Nostri S. R. E. Cardinalis eiusdem S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Praefecti, sive Venerabilium Fratrum Archiepiscopi Agraensis et Episcopi Lahorensis benigne exceptis, quibus commissum fuerat praestitutae huius archidioecesis limites praefinire, his, qui sequuntur, districtibus eandem archidioecesim constare decrevimus. Itaque ab archidioecesi Agraensi seiungantur districtus quorum vulgo nomina : 'Simla, Ambala, Hissar, Karnal, Patiala, Nakha, Jind, Loharu et Maler Kotla,' atque e dioecesi Lahorensi districtus seiungantur, vulgo nuncupati : 'Mandi, Suket, Kulu, Lahul et Spiti,' atque ex his omnibus nova archidioecesis componatur, quae est Simlensis appellanda. Decernentes, praesentes litteras firmas, validas et efficaces existere et fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri et obtinere, illisque ad quos spectat et spectare poterit in omnibus et per omnia plenissime suffragari, sicque in praemissis per quoscumque iudices ordinarios et delegatos iudicari et definiri debere, atque irritum et inane, sic secus super his a quoquam, quavis auctoritate, scienter vel ignoranter, contigerit attentari. Non obstantibus Nostris et Cancellariae Apostolicae regula de iure quaesito non tollendo, aliisque Constitutionibus et Ordinationibus Apostolicis ceterisque, speciali licet atque individua mentione et derogatione dignis, in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die XIII Septembris MCMX, Pontificatus Nostri anno septimo.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *a. Secretis Status.*

L. ✠ S.

NEW VICARIATE IN EAST AFRICA

ERIGITUR NOVUS VICARIATUS APOSTOLICUS DE ' KILIMA-NJARO ' IN AFRICA ORIENTALI

PIUS PP. X

Ad futuram rei memoriam.—In hoc summo Sacerdotii fastigio, ad quod evecti sumus, cum illud praecipue sit Nobis cordi, ut Christi nomen in universas terras quam maxime propagetur, novas ad hoc Missiones in iis locis libentes erigimus, ubi auctus fidelium numerus id postulare videatur. Itaque cum Apostolicus Vicariatus de Bagamoyo in Africa orientali, haud pridem erectus, non mediocre divina opitulante gratia incrementum habuerit, peropportunum Nobis visum est, quo nascentibus in eadem regione necessitatibus facilius prospici queat, et catholicae fidei progressum impensius foveri, distractam ex huiusmodi Vicariatu borealem partem in novam constituere Missionem. Quare omnibus rei adiunctis cum Venerabilibus Fratribus Nostris S. R. E. Cardinalibus S. Congregationi Christiano nomini propagando praepositis scite naviterque perpensis, motu proprio atque ex certa scientia et matura deliberatione Nostris, deque Apostolicae potestatis Nostrae plenitudine praesentium tenore borealem plagam praedicti Apostolici Vicariatus de Bagamoyo a reliquo eiusdem Missionis territorio seiungimus, atque in novum Vicariatum apostolicum de *Kilima-Njaro* nuncupandum erigimus et constituimus, cuius fines sint : ad Boream Vicariatus apostolicus de Zanzibar ; ad Orientem Oceanus Indicus ; ad Occidentem Vicariatus apostolicus de Unianembe ; an Meridiem vero definiatur cursu Fluminis *Msangassi* ab eius ostio in Oceanum usque ad *Mgera*,—qui locus ad Bagamoyensem Vicariatum pertinere pergat,—atque exinde per lineam quae Occidentem versus prosequitur usque ad limites Vicariatus de Unianembe prope lacum *Balangidda* ad Septentionem loci *Jrangi*. Praeterea novum hunc Vicariatum apostolicum de *Kilima-Njaro* ita constitutum quem omnibus et singulis iuribus, honoribus, privilegiis, indultis frui volumus, quibus apostolici huiusmodi Vicariatus gaudent, eadem Apostolica auctoritate Nostra ac propensa quidem voluntate curis committimus alumnorum Congregationis a Spiritu Sancto et ab Immaculato Mariae Corde. Decernentes, praesentes litteras firmas, validas et efūcaces existere et fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri et obtinere, illisque ad quos spectat et spectare poterit, in omnibus et per omnia plenissime suffragari, sicque in praemissis per quoscumque iudices ordinarios et

delegatos iudicari et definiri debere, atque irritum et inane, si secus super his a quoquam, quavis auctoritate, scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari. Non obstantibus Nostris et Cancellariae Apostolicae regula de iure quaesito non tollendo, aliisque Constitutionibus et Ordinationibus Apostolicis ceterisque, speciali licet atque individua mentione et derogatione dignis, in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die XIII Septembris MCMX, Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *a Secretis Status.*

L. ✠ S.

**THE COLLECT ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE ELECTION
OR TRANSLATION OF BISHOP**

URBIS ET ORBIS

SUPER MISSA SEU COLLECTA IN ANNIVERSARIO ELECTIONIS
SEU TRANSLATIONIS EPISCOPI, IUXTA CAEREMONIALE EPISCO-
PORUM

Ex Decretis S. R. C. n. 3661 *Halifaxien.* 16 Aprilis 1866 ad III et n. 3876 *Quebecen.* 13 Decembris 1895 ad VIII dies electionis seu translationis Episcopi est ille, in quo provisio Ecclesiae Episcopalis a Summo Pontifice publicatur in Consistorio, sive ipsa electio seu translatio fiat in Consistorio, sive in eo tantum enuncietur electio seu translatio antea facta; atque ab eiusmodi publicatione consistoriali hucusque communiter computatum est anniversarium electionis seu translationis Episcopi ad effectum Missae seu Collectae respondentis iuxta Caeremoniale Episcoporum (lib. II, cap. XXXV). Nunc vero, de mandato SS^mi Domini Nostri Pii Papae X, ex audientia diei 20 nuper elapsi mensis Maii, per Sacram Congregationem Consistorialem patefacto, Sacra Rituum Congregatio statuit ac declarat diem anniversarium electionis seu translationis, in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur in citato libro et capite Caeremonialis Episcoporum, quoad Episcopos in Consistorio electos seu translatos, computandum adhuc esse a die publicationis consistorialis, quoad ceteros vero Episcopos antea electos seu translatos, in posterum non a die enunciationis in Consistorio, sed a die expeditionis decretorum seu Litterarum Apostolicarum ad electionem seu translationem pertinentium; non obstantibus resolutionibus in contrarium hucusque editis. Denique Sacra eadem Congregatio iterum atque opportune declarat, diem anniversarium electionis

seu translationis Episcopi Coadiutoris cum futura successione relate ad Missam ipsam seu Collectam, cessante Coadiuti munere et adveniente Coadiutoris successione, item a die expeditionis decretorum seu Litterarum Apostolicarum pro Coadiutoria supradicta esse computandum; prouti alias resolutum fuit, praesertim in una *Marianopolitana* n. 3440, diei 30 Ianuarii 1878. Atque ita rescripsit, declaravit et servari mandavit ab hac die 8 Iunii 1910.

FR. S. CARD. MARTINELLI, *Praefectus*.

✠ PETRUS LA FONTAINE, *Episc. Charystien., Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

ABBESESSE AND OTHER PERPETUAL SUPERIORS OF
CONVENTS OUTSIDE ITALY

S. CONGREGATIO DE RELIGIOSIS

DE ABBATISSIS ET ALIIS PRAEFECTIS PERPETUIS EXTRA ITALIAM

Cum adhuc perdurent dubia circa extensionem Constitutionis '*Exposcit debitum*,' diei 1 Ianuarii 1583 extra Italiam, re, in Plenariis Comitibus Sacrae Congregationis de Religiosis die 3 Iunii 1910 habitis, proposita, omnibus maturissime perpensis, Eñi ac Rñi Patres Cardinales declarandum censuerunt: *Servandas esse hac in re extra Italiam regulas et constitutiones a Sancta Sede approbatas et consuetudines immemorabiles; facto verbo cum Sanctissimo.*

Sanctissimus autem Dominus Noster Pius Papa X, in Audiencia, die 4 eiusdem mensis Iunii infrascripto Subsecretario concessa, sententiam Eñorum Patrum adprobare et confirmare dignatus est. Contrariis quibuscumque minime obstantibus.

FR. J. C. CARD. VIVES, *Praefectus*.

FRANCISCUS CHERUBINI, *Subsecretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

Gregorius XIII in Consitutione '*Exposcit debitum*' statuit, ut in universa Italia et praesertim in utriusque Siciliae Regnis, Abbatissae et aliae Monasteriis Praefectae, cuiuscumque Ordinis, non amplius in perpetuum, sed ad triennium tantum eligerenter, quo elapso, iterum et pluries, servata forma in Concilio Tridentino statuta, eligi possent.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

THE DAY'S BURDEN. Studies Literary and Political. By T. M. Kettle, M.P. Dublin: Maunsel & Co., Ltd. 1910.

WE have read nothing more brilliant and more hopeful for a long time than these studies of Professor Kettle, and we may congratulate the National University of Ireland on having secured the services of so able and distinguished a man. A few more like him will make the institution throb with life and interest, and leave far behind it all competitors. We cannot yet say, of course, how successful he may be in the department of Irish Economics; but this volume reveals a mind that ought to be successful at almost anything it applies itself to. At all events, taking these essays for what they are, and what they purport to be, it is a real pleasure to come in contact with a mind so cultured, so well informed, so free from the wooden rigidity of the pedant, and so capable of helping his countrymen to move towards the higher life.

Mr. Kettle is in full sympathy with all that is best in the Gaelic movement, and with all that is hopeful in the revival of the national language, but he gives admirable expression in his Preface to a thought which has hitherto been received with much contempt by persons whose vision is limited by the boundaries of a parish or a county:—

‘A national literature,’ he says, ‘that seeks to found itself in isolation from the general life of humanity can only produce the pale and waxen growth of a plant isolated from the sunlight. In gaining her own soul Ireland will gain the whole world.’

That idea, with its elucidation in his short Preface, is the keynote of the book.

The volume is made up of various papers contributed to magazines and reviews at home and in England. There is, however, one paper that appears here for the first time; and this one appears to me to be the ablest and most interesting of the collection. It is an account of the new variety of socialism excogitated by Otto Effertz, who is picturesquely described

as a 'gentleman socialist.' There are some underlying ideas in this new phase of the old doctrine that may be recognized in a different shape in the encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII. Pope Leo expounded and upheld the teaching of St. Thomas that although ownership of land in the strict sense could only be admitted in the case of those in actual possession, still the whole community owned the land in the sense that directly or indirectly they derived their nourishment, and had a right to their nourishment, from it. In so far, says Effertz, as a man eats and drinks and clothes and houses himself, to that extent he owns land; for food and drink and clothes and shelter represent land. It is a mistake, therefore, to say that those who are not in actual possession of titles to the exclusive exploitation of any parcel of land are not in any sense owners of land. They are and must be owners in the broad sense; otherwise, how could they eat and drink and clothe and shelter themselves?

Mr. Kettle has a fine essay on Anatole France, which had already appeared, I think, in the *Fortnightly Review*. Here Mr. Kettle shows himself a master of the keen analysis and cultured methods which we are accustomed to associate with the names of Sainte-Beuve, Vauvenargues, Shèrer, Houssaye, Brunetière, Rod, Doumic, Russell Lowell, Matthew Arnold, and Benson (of the 'College Window'). There are features of the famous novelist that he has not touched upon, and that we should like to see him hit off in a happy phrase. Anatole France is, perhaps, the novelist of our time who has made the novel one of the most powerful of political engines. When he has done with the Royalists and their Boulangers, and their Christianis, and their Diana Vaughans, they are a tattered and discredited party whom no one could bring himself to respect. Then who is there in the present ranks of novel-writers who can compare with him in sketching a character? He presents it to you as he has caught it from life. We can never again mistake one whom he outlines as 'mince, grêle, pauvre de chair, de poil, de voix, et de pensée; il avait toutes les petitesses, un pied et une âme de demoiselle'; or, again: 'Il avait cet air de submergé que prennent les myopes quand ils ont perdu leur lorgnon.' And then what fun he can make of his opponents. How he makes one laugh at the 'troublons' and the 'pengouins'! 'Un jour vint quand les "troublons" crevèrent, parcequ'ils étaient pleins de vent.' Mr. Kettle gives a clear and correct notion of the 'Ile des Pengouins,' and at the end he expresses a sound opinion

as to the value of this man's work. The veering of his thought and the shifting of his attitude are nimbly pursued, and his methods of procedure subjected to a subtle analysis. Mr. Kettle has at command all the technicalities and even the jargon of his craft. He is a twentieth-century man, and not an echo of the nineteenth.

Mr. Kettle brought with him from University College, Dublin, light and culture sufficient to enable him to pick his steps with care at a Socialist Congress in Stuttgart and an Egyptian Nationalist Congress in Geneva. I do not know that I could share altogether, for the present at least, his evident desire for the withdrawal of the British from Egypt. I have met many Egyptians—pachas, beys, bankers, merchants, and missionaries—and I confess their almost unanimous testimony was that Egypt has made immense strides in prosperity since the British went there; that life and property were never so secure as they are now; that Christians get a fair field under the British flag, if they get no favour; and that the cry of Egypt for the Egyptians means nothing more or less than Egypt for the Mohammedans. I quite admit the danger for the Church to identify itself in any country with a foreign power which must ultimately be driven out; but there is greater danger in encouraging and backing up a movement which would mean in all probability the extinction of Christianity in a whole nation.

J. F. H.

MEZZOGIORNO. By John Ayscough. London: Chatto & Windus. 1910.

Mezzogiorno is a novel dealing with the history of a soul which, in its earlier stage, is encumbered by habits due to a wandering cosmopolitan life, with its easy acceptance of things as they are and as they come. It would seem as if a certain hour and a certain place, a certain *milieu* in fact, were necessary to a full realization of its latent powers and affections; and midway in the novel, as in a third act of Shakespeare, comes the climax in the soul-searching enquiry of the old sun-dial in an English garden: 'Pereunt et imputantur.' It is the whispered *quo vadis* by which the soul of the world is haunted.

In the case of Gillian, the principal character in *Mezzogiorno*, the answer to the riddle is found in the person of Philip Andros, an English Catholic squire, and in the religion he professes. The novel, as I have said, represents two phases of life—the flitting

cosmopolitan life living, at its highest, for soulless artistic sensations: a life of mere colour without depth of meaning—ignoring questions of the future life. This is symbolized in Gillian's early attachment to the Greek, Eustachio, whose outward beauty of form hides a debased and mean nature; and in her later marriage with the old and rich Duca de Torre Greca.

The second phase, as depicted in the latter half of the novel, introduces us to the quiet and conservative atmosphere of an English Catholic home—a home in which Gillian ultimately finds the answer to the feverish problems of her youth. Incidentally there is much interesting criticism of men, books, and 'other things.'

The character of the parson, Mr. Wentworth, is sketched in no biassed way: his natural virtues are emphasized, and the supernatural ones are as little in evidence as in most of the characters in *Barchester Towers*. In contrast to him the priest, Father Pope, is brought into strong relief: not but that Father Pope is represented as having strong political views on certain questions now very much in the air; he is certainly not on the side of a 'silly man who is trying to get excited about the House of Lords.' The strained relations between husband and wife in the last chapters of the story recall the denouement in Ibsen's *A Doll's House*; but the treatment of the problem in *Mezzogiorno* reveals how utterly opposed is the Catholic idea of the marriage bond to that which prevails in communities which claim to be Christian. We may leave the book itself to introduce the reader to many other interesting characters and to many piquant references to modern things which give actuality to the romantic element in the novel.

P. M'S.

BACK TO HOLY CHURCH. By Dr. Albert von Ruville, Professor at the University of Halle, Wittenberg. Translated by G. Schoetenzack. Edited, with Preface, by Rev. R. H. Benson. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1910.

JUST as Newman was forced, in justice to himself, to defend himself from the attacks made upon him consequent on his conversion, so Professor von Ruville was forced to publish an account, in the work under review, of the reasons which led him to become a Catholic. 'It is not agreeable,' he says, 'to speak

so much about oneself, or to expose such *experiences* of the inner life to publicity. I have therefore lingered as briefly as possible on those points, and have given fuller space to the knowledge which I have gained.'

Albert von Ruville was born of Protestant parents on July 7, 1853. Following family traditions he entered the army in 1875, served as officer for thirteen years, and made journeys to North and Central America. In 1888 he left the army, and commenced historical studies at Berlin University under Treitschke, Koser, Lenz, Marcks, and Bresslau. In 1896 he was appointed Lecturer at the University of Halle-a-S., and later, in 1905, Professor of Modern History. He is well known in England as the author of *The Life of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham* (translated into English, and published by Heinemann).

In the account he gives of his conversion in *Back to Holy Church* we can discover two distinct influences which made for that conversion. On the one hand, it is clear that von Ruville had a firm belief in the value of prayer; and this led him to test over and over again the religious system in which he was reared, to see whether it answered to the full the call which the religious sense in him made upon it. By slow and painful degrees he came to realize how largely negative was its character: how it thwarted and set its face against impulses and conclusions which flowed naturally from the central doctrine of the Incarnation. On the other hand, external influences made themselves felt: amongst these, two works, written from points of view as far apart as the Poles, intensified his faith in the leading doctrines of Christianity: the one being the *Nature of Christianity*, by the great rationalist historian, Harnack; the other, the *Divina Commedia* of Dante. The admissions of Harnack as to the historical position of Christ were so striking that the result was a 'conviction,' says von Ruville, 'which quite overwhelmed me and could not fail to lead me to the Faith of the Church, to the Apostles' Creed.' The reading of the *Divina Commedia* led him to a high appreciation of the Catholic teaching as to the future life. 'I read once more,' he says, 'the deep and grand exposition of it in Dante's *Divina Commedia* with more insight and satisfaction than ever.' Throughout his work von Ruville deals in a sincere and masterly fashion with the principal difficulties which a Protestant has to surmount in order to arrive at a true understanding of the Catholic Church. The doctrine of the Communion of Saints, the honour given to Our Lady, the tem-

poral power of the Popes, the question of liberty of investigation and of Infallibility, and, above all, the teaching concerning the Holy Eucharist, are dealt with in a way which shows how thoroughly at home the author is in the Catholic world of ideas. And this is all the more surprising when we remember that his submission to the Church took place at such a recent date as March 6, 1909. I have, I hope, sufficiently awakened interest in the work by indicating a few of the many interesting features in it. Amidst the many accounts given to the world of striking conversions to the Church that of the Professor of History in the University so closely associated with that one which Luther made a centre of propagation for his heretical teaching will occupy a high place.

P. M'S.

THE COST OF A CROWN. A Sacred Drama in three Acts.
By Robert H. Benson. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

The Cost of a Crown is a sacred drama in three Acts, written by Father Robert Hugh Benson for the occasion of the Centenary of St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw. Father Benson apologizes for the comparative incoherence of the plot, necessitated by adherence to historical fact. The hero—and the word is used here in no conventional sense—is the Venerable John Bost, whose betrayal by his former friend and whose martyrdom form the climax of the piece. We get a charming glimpse of Douay, and of the fiery zeal of the young men who were preparing there to minister to the spiritual wants of the English Catholics in Elizabeth's days. Father Benson is quite at home in this period, and makes us live over again the life in the old English manor houses, where the Catholic priest found so often a secure refuge. Any incoherence in the plot is more than made up for by the unity which the overshadowing sense of danger gives the play. The dialogue is at once realistic and emotional; whilst the pent-up emotion of the prose dialogue escapes here and there into charming verse. The only fault we have to find with Father Benson is that he leaves us but so short a time in the company of the Venerable John Bost: sufficiently long, however, to let us see that we have been peering into the heart of a saint.

P. M'S.

COMMENTARIUM THEOLOGICUM, auctore Joanne MacGuinness, C.M., in Collegio Hibernorum Parisiensi Theologiae Professore. Editio altera. Tomus Secundus complectens Tractatus De Deo Trino et Creatore, De Verbo Incarnato, De Gratia et de Virtutibus Infusis. Parisiis : P. Lethielleux ; Dublinii : M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

WE congratulate Father MacGuinness on the publication of the second edition of the important tracts which the title-page of this volume mentions. Our readers are so well acquainted with the great merits of Father MacGuinness's books it would be superfluous on our part to do much more than call their attention to the present publication. We have rarely become acquainted with more suitable text-books for students, or more desirable treatises on dogmatic questions for priests on the mission. The characteristic clearness and fullness of the various volumes are their best recommendation. When we add to these qualifications the intense loyalty of the author to Catholic principles, we place before our readers a truthful picture of the books of Father MacGuinness. We find no doubtful voice in these volumes ; when Catholic faith is concerned no coquetting with Modernist speculations is admitted into these books ; they are a faithful record of the teaching which has been handed down in the tradition of the Church.

The importance of the present volume is seen from the subjects with which it deals. The Trinity, the Creation, the Incarnation, Grace, and the Infused Virtues, are discussed with all desirable fullness. Particular attention is paid to the historical aspects of these questions, and the various objections urged against Catholic truth are handled in a masterful manner.

We again congratulate Father MacGuinness on the publication of this second edition, and we felicitate our sister college on the possession of admirable tracts on the whole course of dogmatic theology.

J. M. H.

HYMNS AND POEMS. By Edward Caswall, Priest of the Oratory. A New Edition. London : Burns & Oates.

FATHER CASWALL was one of that devout band of Anglicans that the Oxford Movement and the Tracts for the Times sent into the Church. He had been ordained for the Anglican ministry in 1839, and eight years after he and his wife were


received into the Catholic fold by Cardinal Acton in Rome. Two years later his wife died, and Edward Caswall offered himself without delay as a novice to Cardinal Newman's Oratory at Birmingham. He was ordained priest in 1852, and remained in the Oratory until his death in 1878. He is remembered as an original writer in prose by the *Art of Pluck*; in verse by his hymns, which are sung with Father Faber's everywhere throughout the English-speaking world, not only in Catholic churches, but in the Church of England and, strangely, with modifications, even by Unitarian congregations; for Father Caswall, who retained the copyright of his hymns, was always willing to allow their use when he thought they might do good.

The volume in review contains all his poems, original and translated. Among the former the two which are dramatic in form, 'The Masque of Angels before Our Lady in the Temple,' and 'The Minister of Eld,' should be better known, for they are very beautiful. The translated poems comprise all the hymns from the Roman Breviary, the Sequences from the Missal, and others from various Latin Offices not found in our Breviary, some from the German and some from the Italian.

Father Caswall's hymns are familiar to many who have never heard of their author. How many know that they owe the favourite Christmas hymn, 'See, amid the Winter Snow'; the exquisite 'Sleep, Jesu, Sleep'; the translation of St. Bernard's *Jesu dulcis memoria*, 'Jesus, the very Thought of Thee'; of the *Stabat Mater*, 'At the Cross her Station Keeping'; or 'When Morning Gilds the Skies,' to this gentle poet? Sweetness, simplicity, and the warm glow of fervent piety characterize all his poems; to these traits we may add a remarkable fidelity to his translations which oftentimes reproduces not only the sense but the metre of the originals.

BLESSED JOAN OF ARC. By E. A. Ford. New York :
Christian Press Association.

THIS book tells the complete story of Joan of Arc, her wonderful life, tragic death, rehabilitation, and beatification in brief but satisfying outline. The author makes good use of the abundant and authentic materials that the recent process of beatification of Blessed Joan called into prominence. The religious and patriotic aspects of her marvellous career are treated with full sympathy. The book is well illustrated.



UNIVERSITY STUDENTS AFIELD¹

AT the beginning of our first year in this University of the North we reviewed briefly the attitude of the Catholic Church with regard to Education.² We saw that the Church in every age has watched over the education of the young with jealous care ; that she has waged unceasing warfare against those who would rob her children of religious influences in their tender years ; that she wishes everyone to combine the highest learning with the most exalted virtue ; that she holds out before all the true Christian ideal : *Scholars who are Saints and Saints who are Scholars*. On the present occasion our subject will be somewhat less theoretical. We shall consider some ways and means of following out in practice the noble ideal set before us. We shall consider our attitude in regard to Catholic organization and charitable associations. We shall ask ourselves this question : Is there anything within the wide range of the corporal or spiritual works of mercy in which we could at present give a helping hand without encroaching in any way upon the time and energy necessary for our professional studies ? If such there be, then I can see no justification whatever for making excuses or shirking the work.

Let me say at the outset that I am convinced there is

¹ Paper read before Catholic Students of the Queen's University of Belfast at the opening meeting of their second year in the University.

² Cf. I. E. RECORD, February, 1910, 'Catholic Ideals in Education.'

ample scope for the talents and energy of all our young men in the various works taken up by the St. Vincent de Paul Society of our city. Some of those who meet here to-day for the first time amongst the Catholic students may not be aware that in the beginning of June last a Conference of that Society was formed in connexion with the University with the sanction and encouragement of his Lordship the Bishop of the diocese. It is known as the *University Students' Conference*, and has been actively at work since that time. It is a question for each individual whether he ought to become a member of the Conference. The object of the present paper is to invite your attention to that question.

It has been wisely said that a people without a purpose is like a river that has lost itself in the sands. The same might with equal truth be said of a body of University students. A few years will find us so many scattered units. Why not band ourselves together for a common purpose? And if the link that binds us be the bond of living charity, what good may we not hope to achieve both for ourselves and for our fellow-man? We cannot get rid of the fact that no body within a nation wields greater power to make or mar that nation's destiny than its University men. Each one exercises an indefinable influence on the little world in which he moves. And we should be surprised if it were otherwise. Every student that enters a University is supposed to be the pick of a hundred school-companions less favoured than himself. People expect him to become a guiding light to the less fortunate many left behind. This is, perhaps, more true in our own land than elsewhere, for not yet has reverence for learning died within the Irish heart. Hence the necessity of our moving forward to the work of life with concentrated purpose and with a good *esprit de corps*. This is all the more important at the present day, as we are assured by many who have studied deeply the problems of the time, that a great awakening is already taking place not only at home, but also amongst the nations around us. It is no great industrial revival, no great movement in the political arena, no great literary

or intellectual renaissance that is talked about. Upwards of half a century ago a French student, whose heart was aflame with zeal in the cause of religion, surveying the wreck and ruin brought about by the spread of infidel principles in France, wrote as follows to some companions to whom he submitted his schemes and hopes in the work of regeneration :—

Happy shall I be if a few friends come and rally round me. Then we should unite our efforts, and create a work together ; others would join us, and, perchance, the day would come when all mankind would be gathered together beneath the same protecting shade. Catholicism in its eternal youth and strength would rise suddenly on the world, and, placing itself at the head of the age, lead on to civilization and to happiness.¹

Frederick Ozanam was a young man when he wrote these hopeful—or rather, prophetic—words. He lived to see, if not the beginnings, at least the certain signs of that awakening. His words, if it were possible to condense them further, would have a striking resemblance to the motto of our present Holy Father, *Instaurare omnia in Christo*.

If the world is to be brought back to Christian ideals and Christian principles, what is to be Ireland's share in the great movement? You do not need to be reminded that when the light of Christianity was to be spread throughout the nations of Europe the Island of Saints and Scholars held no second place. If she was in the vanguard then, will she be ready to resume her former place of honour in the coming crisis? The spirit of the young men and women who come forth from her new Universities will go far to decide that question. This new awakening is no mere dream, nor is Ireland's place in it a matter of patriotic sentiment. Let me merely recall to you the words of the

¹ *Frederick Ozanam, his Life and Works*, by K. O'Meara. Cf. also *Frederick Ozanam*, by B. F. C. Costelloe, M.A.; and *Great Catholic Laymen*, by J. J. Horgan.

late Sir William Butler at the Catholic Truth Conference of 1907 :—

The entire English-speaking outside world has become studded with Irish Catholic settlements in the last sixty years. Set there by famine and failure they stand to-day Celtic installations, Irish Marconigraphs, ready to repeat with a million voices the message which Ireland may one day send over the world. The problems that lie before Ireland to-day are full of meaning. Whither are the internal forces moving her ?¹

Things have moved fast since those stirring words were spoken. Two sister Universities have since then been set on foot, and within them the future hope of Ireland under the guidance of men of ability are coming in contact with the world's great minds. From every town and village, from every lowland and glen, the Irish youth are hastening to these new seats of learning. The coming generation must inevitably have its thoughts and aspirations largely coloured by the tone of these Universities. I need not ask : Are the Catholic students here to set a low standard—to confine their thoughts to mere material progress—to have no more worthy object in life than to reach the highest step in their profession and grow rich ? We have in our hands the making of the traditions of this University, as far at least as the Catholic students are concerned. Are these traditions to be good or—well, not quite so good ? Will the coming generations of men and women that pass from these halls be moulded into sympathy with the spiritual mission of the Irish race ? Will they come forth such as seek to realize in their lives the standard that our Divine Master has set up for all His followers, but especially for those who, by their sacred character or by their exalted position in society, have the eyes of the world fixed upon them : ' You are the salt of the earth ' ; ' You are the light of the world.' If we could only feel confident of this, then might we safely prophesy that Erin's message to her sons and daughters abroad would be a message worthy of a

¹ *Why not as We once Were ?* By Lieut.-General Sir Wm. F. Butler, G.C.B.

Catholic nation. Thus should we be doing our little best, while here we may, to co-operate with Christ's Vicar on earth in the glorious work of 'renewing all things in Christ.'

The superficial observer may strive to persuade us that any great Catholic revival must as yet be afar off. He may point to the serried columns of our enemies marshalled with all the skill and might and splendour that wealth and worldly wisdom can secure. He may instance the rapid advances of Socialism, which in its onward march is daily gathering into its ranks the unlettered masses, who are attracted to it by the vision of a millennium of peace and plenty, in which they are to stand on equal footing with the rich and noble. He may point to an all-powerful anti-Catholic and oftentimes immoral Press which lives and flourishes on misrepresentation and corruption. He may point to a growing output of cheap infidel literature—nay, pardon me, trash, with a thin veneer of morality—that is finding its way to the home of the remote peasant and bringing the germs of spiritual and moral disease to the innocent children, blighting the fairest buds on God's earth, tainting the sweetest flowers within the garden of the Lord. He may remind us that the unrest in the religious world outside the Catholic Church is subsiding gradually into religious indifference, which in its turn is infecting the atmosphere around and germinating even amongst Catholics themselves an indifference towards old-time practices and customs. He may show us that already to a limited extent in Catholic circles the whole-hearted devotion to Mother Church is slowly dying away, and being replaced by a critical and anti-clerical spirit which, by continually clamouring against priestly influence, whether in the schools or on the social platform, would gladly fan the flame of distrust between the people and their pastor. All these disturbing facts of modern life he might point out to us, and many more besides, and then, smiling at our credulity, ask: Do you hope to cure the monstrous evils that are growing around you by joining men together in an organization for the doling out of scanty alms amongst the poor? Is it likely, he will say, that a little

knot of men banded together for a work of common charity will succeed in bringing about a widespread return to Christian life?

To such a question our answer, presumptuous though it may appear, can only be a firm and emphatic 'yes.' The faith of Patrick, Brigid and Columbkille has lived through perils greater far than these; and with the grace of God that same undying faith shall rise victorious over all its enemies again. The Society of St. Vincent de Paul embraces within its programme the remedy of all the evils that threaten Christ's earthly kingdom at the present time. The Society sprang into life from the inspiration that intelligent laymen banded together for mutual sanctification and works of charity could do at least something to withstand the fury of the storms that were gathering around the Church in France. Its very existence was an answer to a challenge. Its work was to be a proof that the power of Catholicity was not dead. The Society set itself to make a stand against every coming danger. It enlarged its field of work from year to year. Its members multiplied as if by magic. And now that it spreads its influence throughout the Christian world, and brings together the enlightened Catholics of every race and clime, levying as it were a lay army under the guidance of the priests and Bishops, neither shall its field of work decrease, nor its power for good grow weaker. Its main object is not to dole out alms, as is sometimes thought. It was founded with a spiritual rather than a temporal object. Yet because it goes to the root of an evil and seeks to remove its source, the Society has been singularly successful in uplifting the poor and ignorant from their degradation.

We may think out great plans [writes M. F. Healy] and organize great national schemes for the relief of poverty—such plans have been made, such schemes have been prepared, and have failed; while the Society founded by a few French students amid the scoffs of their contemporaries can claim to have achieved almost the full measure of success to which it modestly addressed itself, and seems destined to be the vanguard of organized charity for all time.

If some of you have still some lingering doubts as to whether you ought to join this Society or not, permit me to recall to your minds the oft-repeated story of its foundation. Let me bring you back once more to the student days of Frederick Ozanam, and then let me put to you the practical question: When one earnest layman has done so much, must you—a hundred Catholic students—confess that you can do—nothing?

Frederick Ozanam, the founder of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, was, I need scarcely remind you, a University student. He had come to Paris in 1831, at the age of eighteen, to study law. His life up to that time may be briefly told. He was born at Milan in 1813. His father had served with distinction in the Italian campaign under Napoleon, and settling down for a time at Milan had qualified as a medical doctor. Frederick, whilst still a child came with his father and the rest of the family to Lyons, and that was his home for the greater part of his life. There was little remarkable about his boyhood. From a pious father and mother he imbibed that burning zeal for God's poor that characterized his life-work. The vivid picture of these good people drawn by Kathleen O'Meara in her life of Frederick Ozanam is too interesting to pass over:—

Dr. Ozanam never became a rich man. Wealth was never his first aim; he looked upon the medical profession as a sort of priesthood, and divided his labours almost equally between the rich and the poor. His wife for seventeen years seconded him nobly in this apostolate of charity. When they had both grown old, and were no longer able to climb so nimbly up six and seven stories to the garrets where his poorer patients dwelt, they bound each other by a mutual promise not to go beyond the fourth story. . . . The husband and wife were not always loyal in keeping their mutual promise. More than once it happened that the doctor coming discreetly down from the seventh floor where some more than common misery had enticed him, came face to face with his wife treacherously climbing up to it. It was in coming out from one of these abodes of poverty that he eventually met his death. Familiar as he was with the

perils of the dark, broken stairs, he made a false step and fell, injuring himself so severely that he died the next day.

At school Frederick was neither very clever nor very dull, and, if we are to believe his own account, he was not by any means a saint. He seems not to have been averse to those healthy amusements of school-boy life, dignified in polite society by the name of 'pugilistic encounters.' In these muscular contests one promising trait of his character becomes noticeable—obstinacy you may call it if you will, but more lenient judges would see in it only dogged determination. His school-fellows would ask him sometimes after one of these fights to confess that he was beaten: he would stamp his foot, and declare that he would rather die than say it. There was, therefore, in Frederick the makings of a man of grit.

His First Communion, which he made at the age of eleven, seems to have brought passions that were naturally strong under the influence of divine grace. He tells in a confidential letter to a friend that before that time he was obstinate, passionate, disobedient and lazy to the last degree. To the graces of that glad and blessed day he attributes a great change. 'May my right hand wither,' he writes, 'and may my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if ever I forget that day.'

This serene and joyful time was only the prelude of a storm. He was living in an atmosphere of infidelity. He had not yet been tried as by fire. About the age of fourteen he was haunted by uneasy doubts about his faith. This time of terrible trial brought him to the verge of unbelief. But prayer and innocence of life saved him. He looked to the Abbé Noirot for guidance, and this good priest gave much light and assistance to his favourite pupil. One day on entering a church Frederick threw himself on his knees, and with all the earnestness of his soul besought God to deliver him from this mental torture. He promised that if he received light to see the truth he would spend himself in its defence. The promise was accepted, and the trial passed away. These months of darkness left an impress

on his whole life. In the last work he ever wrote he refers to the terrible danger he had escaped :—

I clung [he says] to the sacred dogmas in desperation, but they seemed to break in my grasp ; then it was that one who **was** both a priest and a philosopher saved me ; he brought light into my mind ; I believed henceforth with an assured faith, and, touched by this mercy, vowed to consecrate my days to the service of that Truth that had given me peace.

At the age of sixteen Frederick was placed as a clerk in an attorney's office at Lyons. His father still dreaded to send him so young to the dangerous atmosphere of a French University, where very many promising youths had suffered shipwreck. His new work was far from congenial. Yet during the two years that he remained in this position he mastered several languages and read enormously. A few words from a letter written when he was seventeen give an indication of his unflinching determination :—

If I mean to write a book at thirty-five, I must begin to prepare for it at eighteen, for the preliminary studies are multitudinous. I must acquire twelve languages so as to be able to consult sources and documents. I must be fairly master of geology and astronomy in order to discuss the chronological and cosmological systems of peoples and *savants*. I must master universal history in all its breadth, and the history of religious creeds in all its depth.

If Ozanam read hard, his pen was not idle. Before he was quite eighteen he had written and published a refutation of the St. Simonians, a new sect which sprung forth from the chaos of successive revolutions and kept belauding the Catholicity of the past, whilst decrying the Catholicity of the present as barren, effete, out-of-date—a dying creed. Lamartine wrote to encourage the youthful apologist and to express his admiration.

Dr. Ozanam felt that his son was destined for something higher than the drudgery of an attorney's office, and Frederick, on his part, had made up his mind to study law. He was now eighteen years of age. In November, 1831, he left the paternal roof, and set out for Paris. Here he had

the good fortune to enjoy the society and friendship of such eminent Catholics as M. Ampère, M. de Chateaubriand, and the young Count de Montalembert. But withal, to his ardent temperament the godless atmosphere of Paris was chilling in the extreme. No wonder that he writes soon after his arrival: 'I dislike Paris because there is no life here, no faith, no love; it is like a huge corpse to which my youth is chained alive, and whose icy coldness freezes, whilst its corruption poisons me.'

Much as he detested life in the French capital he found things in the University itself far worse. Few, if any, of his fellow-students professed a vestige of Christianity. As time went on, he found many Catholics amongst them, but they were ashamed for the most part to make their beliefs known. Infidelity, whether of the scoffing or indifferent type, was the fashion of the day. The professors of the University were accustomed to attack the doctrines of Christianity, and often backed up their attack by calumny. Here was Ozanam's opportunity. He and his lifelong friend, Lallier, organized a defence. They determined that misrepresentation and misstatement should not go unchallenged. The result was successful beyond their expectation. One typical instance is told by Frederick himself: 'Our answers were publicly read, and produced the best effect both on the professor, who as good as retracted his words, and on the audience who applauded.' After a few set answers of this kind, the professors began to learn caution in their attacks, and the Catholic students, now heartily ashamed of their weakness, determined to form a young Catholic alliance. A place of meeting was required. This was offered by a worthy gentleman, named M. Bailly, editor of the *Tribune Catholique*, a paper devoted to the defence of Catholic interests. 'He was a poor man, but whenever there was a service to be rendered to the cause of truth, or the young, he contrived somehow to find the necessary means.' In his newspaper office the young Catholic party met once a week. There they held their discussions and debates with their opponents, and M. Bailly gave them invaluable assistance by his experience and wisdom.

Everything seemed to point in a wonderful way to the realization of that which Ozanam yearned to see—'a reunion of friends working together at the edifice of science, under the flag of Catholic ideas.' Not yet, however, was he satisfied. Something further was wanting. He was forced to listen daily to the taunts of his fellow-students, 'Show us your works,' he would hear them say; 'Catholicity was grand and mighty in the past. What has she to show now? Her strength is decayed, her glory dead.' Ozanam would then say to his companions-in-arms: 'It is all very well talking and arguing and holding one's own against them, but can we not *do* something? Let us to the front! Let our deeds be in accordance with our faith.'

Their meetings so far had been little more than debating clubs, where religious questions were discussed in the most friendly spirit with their opponents. Ozanam now suggested a weekly meeting which should include none but Catholics. The new association thus formed should confine its discussions to the organization of charitable work. This Ozanam saw would be a practical rebuff to the taunts of the St. Simonians. M. Bailly at once fell in with the idea, and again placed the office of his paper at their disposal. Thus was formed the nucleus of that immense family of brothers known as the St. Vincent de Paul Society.

In May, 1833, the first meeting took place. M. Bailly was moved to the chair. His opening Address to the eight members assembled gives an indication of the spirit that has remained in the Society, and that actuates its members at the present day:—

If you intend [said he] that your work should be really efficacious, if you are earnest about serving the poor as well as yourselves, you must not let it be a mere doling out of alms; bring each your pittance of money and food; you must make it a medium of moral assistance, you must give them the alms of good advice. . . . Most of you are studying to be lawyers, some of you to be doctors, and so forth; go and help the poor each in your special line; let your studies be of use to others as well as yourselves; it is a good way and an easy way of commencing your apostolate as Christians in the world.

Soon a plan of work was agreed upon and adopted. The members placed themselves under the protection of St. Vincent de Paul. The rules were drawn up. Meetings were to begin and end in prayer. Members were to meet each week and report their experiences. The moneys given out in charity were to be taken from a common fund. A secret collection was to be made at the weekly meetings to receive whatever each member could afford. Discussion of politics or personal concerns at the meetings was forbidden ; and no one was to use the Society as a stepping-stone to worldly advancement.

Such is the brief story of the small beginnings of the St. Vincent de Paul Society. The grain of mustard seed has now grown to be an immense tree, and has spread its branches over the entire earth. Its influence is felt in the Catholic Press, in the propagation of a healthy Catholic literature, in the defence of Catholic education, in the fight against every moral evil. In the slums of our big cities the ministers of charity move around. There they uplift the fallen, instruct the ignorant, bring hope and happiness to cheerless homes. After the example of their patron, St. Vincent, they lead back to the Divine Master the neglected children whom He loves. They receive no earthly reward. They see in the poor and degraded only so many souls to be rescued from ruin and won back to God. And so they work unsparingly, knowing that they serve a Master whose promise will not fail and whose judgment will be merciful to the charitable :—

I was hungry, and you gave Me to eat ; I was thirsty, and you gave Me to drink ; I was a stranger, and you took Me in ; naked, and you covered Me ; sick, and you visited Me ; I was in prison, and you came to Me. . . . Amen, I say to you, as long as you did it to one of these My least brethren, you did it to Me.

The rest of the life of Frederick Ozanam falls outside the scope of this paper. Yet I regret to leave a meagre sketch, an unfinished picture, of such a grand, noble character. You do not need to be told that when the Society was set on a working basis his devotion and zeal did not flag.

Overwhelmed as he was with professional duties he found time to help on the most varied works of charity. He presided over a literary conference for the young men. He set up a reading library for soldiers and procured for them religious instruction. The rich also came in for a share of his charity. In conjunction with the Archbishop he secured the courses of Lenten lectures, known as the Conferences of Lacordaire, which did so much to revive amongst the *élite* of Paris the religious principles that had been all but swept away by frequent revolutions. He started a Catholic paper to break down ancient prejudices that kept French Catholics politically divided. He left written works that are a more enduring evidence of his learning than the brilliant lectures he delivered as a Professor of the Sorbonne, or the epoch-making essay on Dante by which he obtained his degree of Doctor of Letters at the age of twenty-five. His married life was exceedingly happy. He was blessed with a virtuous wife, whose love for the poor equalled, if it did not exceed, his own. On one occasion, when he had to choose between a lucrative position at Lyons and a comparatively poor position at Paris, where the field of his charitable work lay, his wife cheerfully elected for poverty. A man who found time to visit the sick and to write five articles in an examination week was not likely to spare himself in any work he had undertaken. Hence we are not surprised to learn that he brought himself to an early grave. He died on the Feast of the Nativity of our Blessed Lady, September 8, 1853, at the age of forty years.

His character is admirably summed up in a few lines from the pen of Cardinal Manning :—

Such was Frederick Ozanam, a pure and noble soul on fire with charity to all men, especially the poor ; consumed by zeal in the service of truth ; pious, with filial tenderness ; exemplary in every path of life ; more eloquent in the supernatural beauty of his thoughts than in the loving words which fell from his lips ; more illuminated with the ardour of Christian faith than with the manifold lights of literary cultivation : such a man bore in him a Catholic heart full of all instinctive loyalty, as ready to give his life for a jot or tittle of the faith, or for a definition of

the Divine authority of the Church, as he was to counsel the Archbishop of Paris to tread in the steps of the Good Shepherd and lay down his life for his sheep. May God raise up on every side laymen like Frederick Ozanam!

To add another word to the Cardinal's brief summary would be superfluous. It is not too much to hope that we have here amongst us many who will be in the near future leading spirits in the cause of charity. In the life of Frederick Ozanam they have a constant inspiration. Let them study that life that was consumed as it were in the fire of charity. They will see in Ozanam a man of faith, a man of prayer, a man of zeal. They will see in him the combination of the saint and the scholar. His example will induce them to join their companions in the wide field of charitable work that lies before them. 'The harvest indeed is great; the labourers are few.' You cannot close your eyes to the immense field of work that lies around you in this city. You can use your talents in any way you wish. You may take part in the spread of Catholic literature, in the study of social work, in the fight against godless education, or in combating the anti-Christian spirit of the Press and periodicals. You may give invaluable help in levelling down the barriers between the rich and poor, in visiting boys' clubs, in looking after the Catholic seamen around the docks, in promoting the work of penny banks, in finding a refuge for the victims of degradation and vice, in bringing spiritual and temporal comfort to the homes of the poverty-stricken. Nothing that can promote the glory of God's Church and the salvation of souls is outside the work of the Society. What a wide field of work! Why not, then, be up and doing? You cannot but feel that the words of our Divine Master have a special meaning for you, as He pointed out to His disciples the city of Samaria and the surrounding districts that had not yet received His teaching: 'Do not you say there are yet four months and then the harvest cometh? Behold I say to you, lift up your eyes and see the countries for they are white already to harvest.' If the students of this University take an active interest in these works of charity, if you persevere, as you have begun,

in doing good with one mind and one heart both to the poor and to one another, then will you be giving the best proof that you have not lost the spirit of the disciples of the Son of Man, who made charity the test of His true followers: 'By this shall men know that you are My disciples, if you have love one for another.'

JAMES P. CLENAGHAN.

GLIMPSES OF THE PENAL TIMES—XI

IN the preceding article¹ some account was given of the Irish educational establishments existing abroad when it was not possible to have them at home. They were numerous and, as a rule, well filled. All through the territories extending from Lisbon to Prague, and from Douay to Rome, these Irish seminaries were to be found. And besides the groups of students—either priests already or preparing for priesthood—that resided in them, many individuals were received into colleges founded for the natives of those continental countries. Thus, despite great obstacles, in more than twenty places the sons of St. Patrick were to be met with, all getting ready to continue his mission and to preserve at any sacrifice the faith which he had planted in Erin. Undaunted by the thought of what probably would be their lot, these devoted young ecclesiastics resolved to return home and to brave every danger as soon as their college course was finished. With considerable inconvenience and very often with considerable risk they had gone abroad, but such was their desire to be of greater use to the Church that they minded neither discomfort nor danger. And this love of knowledge was not confined to the clergy, for many of the laity encountered every peril in order to obtain a better education on the Continent. From generation to generation this struggle, the true *Kulturkampf*, was maintained against the heretical power which on its side used every effort to uproot nationality and learning and religion. Long before the period which forms the chief part of our subject, the reign, namely, of Queen Anne, this remarkable exodus of students had begun.

The fact appears from an official statement made in 1613 which also shows what was thought by the Irish Parliament about foreign education and its results. The

¹I. E. RECORD, October, 1910.

uneasiness and positive alarm which the document betrays is amusing. Instead of witnessing the triumph over religion and learning which it fondly hoped for in consequence of an Act of Queen Elizabeth¹ inflicting a fine of £100 on anyone sending a person abroad to be educated, and of a Proclamation of James I., in 1611, commanding that 'No one henceforth shall send his children or relations beyond seas for education,' the Irish Parliament had to make the humiliating avowal that its unceasing effort to prevent the exit of students were all to no purpose.²

As we can easily believe, a strict watch was kept in order to prevent the students from going and still more to prevent them from coming back. At times it was all but impossible to land on the Irish coast; and if the landing was effected it often led to immediate imprisonment. But notwithstanding the frequent captures, so great was the multitude of missionaries who made the heroic endeavour to enter the green isle that, owing to a sufficient number of successful attempts on their part, the spiritual interests of the people did not suffer. From the foreign colleges the supply of priests never ceased. As soon as one priest was imprisoned, or banished, or put to death, another stepped into his place. This succession was kept up without interruption in spite of every danger. All honour to the Irish students throughout the penal times!

But in the reign of Queen Anne, if not before it, the Irish Executive, seeing itself powerless to prevent the return of ecclesiastics, resolved to make use of a spy in order to find out the names of those who were being educated in certain foreign colleges. For the work a fitting instrument was ready to hand, viz., Edward Tyrell, the notorious informer. He was perhaps the most active and successful priest-catcher in Ireland, and he delighted in the chase. Several depositions of his are still to be seen in the Record Office. At frequent intervals he returned to Dublin in order to report results to the Lords Justices, and to get

¹ 23, 1, and 29, 6.

² See Lodge's *Desiderata curiosa Hiberniæ*, vol. i. p. 417.

paid for his work. His depositions about Bishops and clergy at home will be quoted in subsequent articles; in this one his two depositions about students abroad will be given. Even in them, however, it will incidentally appear that he kept a sharp eye on the Bishops, and possessed considerable information about Catholic families in various parts of the country. Of course the offence of sending their sons abroad to be educated rendered the parents liable to heavy fines.

In 1711 Tyrell got into the Irish Franciscan College of St. Antony, and the Irish Dominican College of Holy Cross, in Louvain. He may not have been the only one to whom such a mission was entrusted, but so far as has been ascertained no document extant in the Record Office shows that any other spy was despatched. We may, therefore, look on Tyrell provisionally as the only envoy. He was uneducated; his handwriting is bad—in fact a scrawl—and as will appear here his spelling is faulty. Sir Constantine Phipps (Lord Chancellor) and Richard Ingoldsby are the Lords Justices to whom he alludes, and the Secretary whom he mentions is the person from whom Dawson Street in Dublin got its name. At the time the Duke of Ormond, who held the office of Lord Lieutenant, was absent from Ireland, as so frequently happened in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Of the documents here inserted the first is endorsed 'Tyrell's Examinations.' The endorsement of the last of the series shows that on that occasion he was examined before the Privy Council. It will be observed that Tyrell, who was anything but a model of veracity, states that Bishops acted from political motives in coming back to Ireland. There are a few mistakes in his 'examinations,' and the second contains a repetition of part of the first.

(Press mark, No. 10,112. 4 Q. 135. 8573.)

COMITATUS WICKLOENSIS.

The examination of Edward Tyrrell formerly at Park in the County of Galway who being sworn saith.

That by virtue of a pass (dated the 9th day of December 1711 and signed by J. Dawson then Secretary to the Lords

Justices) he went from this kingdom for England and thence for Flanders, pursuant to directions from the Lords Justices (from whom he received as he remembers the sum of ten pounds) & upon his coming there he the Deponent made it his business to goe to the Irish cloysters & the English colledges in Flanders aforesaid, & pass there as a son of Roger Floherty of Parke in the County of Gallway, Gentleman, who was very much esteemed in those cloysters and colledges; and after some tyme there, he this Deponent found that the whole management of the heads of those cloysters and colledges tended to the bringing in the Pretender into the kingdom of Great Brettaigne, & to forward that intreige they declared that they had sent severall Popish Bishoppes into Ireland in order to manage that design, and to incense the Popish inhabitants of that kingdom to a rebellion in order to promote Popery and roote out the established religion of the Church of England. And the names of the Popish Bishoppes who were sent over into Ireland being sent first from Flanders to Rome where they were made Bishoppes (according to this Deponent's information) and thence sent for the kingdom of Ireland, whose names, according to the said information is as follows (viz.) John MacMogher, Titular Archbishop of Clogher, Bryan Fitzgerald, Bishopp of Elphin, Owen MacDermott, Bishopp of Lorrh neare Elphin, 'Major MacDonnell' [*some words here are erased*] and Pope Edmond Byrne Bishopp of Dublin, the last of which has ordained clergy within these three weeks last past, being informed thereof by Father John Talbott parish priest of Connaght in the County of Dublin on Saturday last; and that he has one of the said new ordained clergy as a curate to himself; his name being Meghter; but this Deponent could not find out his Christian name. This Deponent further saith that about October last landing in England he found the Duke of Ormonde was in Ireland; and thereupon he made the best of his way for Ireland; and upon his landeing, which was about the beginning of December last, he was taken soe ill with a plurisy and ague, that he was not able to make his application to the Government who employed him, but was by his indisposition forct down to Tassaroe in the county of Wicklow aforesaid, in order to recover his health, & as soon as he was able to stir forth he this Deponent did apply himself to the next Justice of Peace (being Richard Edwards of Old Court, Esq.) & gave him in the examinations before recited: This Deponent further saith that some yeares agoe there was a regiment raised in Ireland for the service of

King Charles of Spaine, whereof one Devonish was Coll., one Kennedy of Dublin Lt. Coll., & amongst the rest of the officers one Edmond Flogherty was Leift which Edmond deserted the said service and then went with sixty of the men of the said regiment or thereabouts, and entertained himself and men in the French King's service, and as this Deponent is informed the said Leift Flogherty is now returned for Ireland, and has joined his brother, Donnell Flogherty (who brought a party of disaffected persons into this kingdom in order to raise a rebellion, to which a great number has since adhered to them) and as this Deponent is credibly informed has committed great outrages. This Deponent further saith that he is very well acquainted with both Capt Donnell Flogherty and his brother & their whole family as well as the whole country where they lived, and believes that the said Capt. and his brother were both sent with some men or purpose (by what this Deponent heard before he left Flanders) to raise rebellion in this kingdom of Ireland, this Deponent further saith that several persons of the Popish religion has sent over their sons to bee educated in the Popish religion beyond the seas contrary to the Act of Parliament for the restreining of them, viz., Councillor McNamara near Killaloe in the County of Clare sent over two sons, one being at St. Germain's and the other a fryar att Lovaine in Flanders, & not sent thither above eighteen months agoe, one Bryan McDermott of the County of Roscommon sent his son to Lovaine about a year ago who was made a ffryar ere this Deponent left that place. And further saith not.

Capt. coram me 4 o die Feb. Martii 1711-12
apud Old Court, Rich. Edwards.

EDWARD TYRELL.

A word may be said about the Bishops mentioned by Tyrell. The first, whom he calls John MacMogher, is commonly known as Hugh MacMahon.¹ Hugh MacMahon, alias Matthaei, had studied in the Irish College (Louvain); he received the degree of D.D., and afterwards was made a Canon of Cassel, in Flanders, of which church his uncle was Provost. In 1703 he became Vicar-General of Clogher, and on March 15, 1707, its Bishop. He wrote on October 6, 1708, to the Internuncio at Brussels that after many diffi-

¹ See Brady's *Episcopal Succession*, vol. i. p. 257.

culties and dangers he had succeeded in reaching Dublin. In 1713 he was translated to Armagh.¹ It will be observed that Tyrell in his second examination gives the Bishop's surname as MacMahon. The second Bishop mentioned by Tyrell has already been spoken of in these pages.² Ambrose MacDermott, O.P., was made Bishop of Elphin on March 15, 1707. The *Historical MSS. Report*³ shows that in April, 1707 (O.S.), James III. sent from St. Germain's a letter to Pope Clement XI., in which he nominated Ambrose MacDermott, at the time Penitentiary in St. Mary Major's, Rome, to the vacant see of Elphin. A copy of the Brief appointing him is in the British Museum.⁴ It is thought that he was consecrated by his friend Cardinal Howard. Gherardino, or Fitzgerald, was the Bishop's alias when travelling. A document in the Propaganda Archives⁵ contains the following: 'Monsignor d'Elfinia Domenicano già Penitentiere in Santa Maria Maggiore promosso a questa chiesa sotto li 32 di Marzo dell'anno passato, che passava in Ibernia sotto nome di Filippo Gherardini.' Tyrell, who was usually accurate, fell into a mistake this time, for he made two persons out of one. The third prelate whom he by the way styles 'pope,' namely, Edmond Byrne, Archbishop of Dublin, was also appointed on the same day as the others, i.e., March 15, 1707, so that Tyrell was right in putting them together.⁶

Tyrell's second examination may now be given.

(No. 10,113. 4 Q. 135. 8573.)

EDWARD TYRRELL.

The examination of Edward Tyrrell, taken before the honorable Richard Mulley Esq. one of her Majesty's Justices of her Court of Queen's Bench in Ireland the 6th day of March, 1711.

Who being duly sworn and examined saith that he having obtained a pass from Mr. Secrittery Dawson bearing date the

¹ For a good account of him, see Father Coleman's *History of Armagh*.

² September, 1907.

³ Stuart Papers, vol. i. p. 213.

⁴ Add. MSS., 'Papers of Cardinal Gualterio,' fol. 149 ff.

⁵ Acta 25 Junii, 1708, *Anglia et Ibernia*, p. 394.

⁶ For a short account of Edmond Byrne, see Brady's *Episcopal Succession*.

month of December 1710 whereby he was permitted by the name of Edward ffitzgerald als Tyrrill to goe from Dublin to London he soon after left the city and went to London where in the space of about fifteen days he arrived on foot, with about the sum of three pounds in his pocket and after he had staid in London about ten days where he lodged in the house of one Springe a Gouldsmith near St. Martin's Lane, he went by water down to Harrige and after he had staid there about ten days he went in a collier to Sasfan Gant where he arrived in about three days, and from thence he went on foot to Gant where he staid about eight days where he met with one ffather Lynch with whom he had been formerly acquainted, that this Examt often heard the said Lynch express his expectation that the Pretender would come home again, that the high church and the low church could not agree & by that means the Pretender would be brought home again, that he had acquaintance with no other person in Gant and that while he continued there he passed by the name of Tyrrill, that from Gant he went to Lovein and there as soon as he came he enquired his way to the Irish Colledge and when he came to it he enquired for the Guardian who came to him, and this Examt passed to him for Edward ffaherty the son of Roger ffaherty of Parke in the County of Galway; and saith that the said Roger ffaherty has a son whose name is Edward and is now at home with his father as he this Examt believes this Examt saith that he found in the said Colledge one fflorence McNamara the son of Councillor McNamara near Killaloe in the County of Clare, a midle sised young man about the age of twenty two years, and who was a novice in that Colledge of about half a year's standing; that this Examt was well acquainted with the said young man and was well known to the said young man for that this Examt was about two years ago at his (the said fflorence McNamara's) fathers house and there saw the said young man at home with his father, that the said young man told this Examt he and his elder brother were sent by their father from Ireland about two years agoe and that they had with them about one houndred pounds, and that the elder brother went to St. Germain's to the Pretender, this Examt further saith that while he was at Lovein one James Tomin a member of the said Colledge and a Regular of the Order of St ffancis and whom he had often seen officiat in the Church there, was ordered to come into Ireland by the Superior of the Franciscan Order who lives in Paris, that during this Examts

stay there he saw the said Father Tumin after he had thrown off his habit in layman's cloaths and the said Tumin told this Exam^t that he was to goe to Dublin to ffather Edmond Byrne, Titular Archbishop of Dublin, and that the said ffather Dillon father Tumin and severall others told this Exam^t about the time that the Pretender was to land in Scotland the said ffather Byrne was by virtue of some order sent by the Pope to the said ffather Dillon and by him sent to Ireland to one Rourk who is a Brother-in-Law to Councillor McDonough & lives in his house in the County of Roscommon, and that Owen McDermod and the said Rourk were likewise made Bishops the same time by virtue of the said Order; and that this Exam^t further saith that he saw in the Colledge belonging to the Order of St Dominick in Lovine one Edward McDermod son to Bryan McDermod of the County of Ross Common whom this Exam^t very well knew before he left the Kingdom and is now a novice belonging to the said Order, and this Exam^t further saith that that one McMahan son to Collado McMahan of the County of Monaghan was some time in the latter end of the last harvest as this Exam^t was informed by ye aforesaid Mr Dillon likewise sent over here as the Bishop of Cloher, who as this Exam^t was informed lived for some years near Leven and had two thousand Guilders per annum as being the first Dr of a Colledge in that place. And this Exam^t further saith that Leift Edmond fflaherty who was in Coll. Devonishe's Regiment that was raised in Ireland for the service of King Charles of Spain deserted the s^d service and went over with seventy of the men of that Regiment to the ffrench King's service, and is since as this Exam^t is informed returned to Ireland and has joyned his brother Donnell Flogherty, and the said Edmond Flogherty has brought a party of disaffected persons into this Kingdom in order to raise a rebellion, to whom a great number have since adhered themselves, and as this Exam^t is credibly informed are the people y^t hough the cattle now in Connaught, & this Exam^t further saith he is very well acquainted with Captain Donnell Flogherty and his brother Edmond, and believes they were sent with some men on purpose to raise a rebellion in this Kingdom, by what this Exam^t heard at the severall convents he had been at in fflanders, that some time the last winter this Exam^t left Leveine having there and in other places got about five pounds to bear his charges to Ireland, and soon after took shipping at Helvoetsluys in the Dolphin packet boat and in about four and twenty hours landed below Harriage,

from whence this Exam^t prosecuted his journey on foot till he came to Parck Gate, where this Exam^t tooke shipping in a Chester Ship and landed at Rings End about ten weeks agoe, from whence this Exam^t went to ffassanghroe near Bray where this Exam^t has since continued until brought to Towne by Coll. Edwards. And further this Exam^t saith not.

Jurat. 6^o die Mart.

coram me

R. Nutley.

EDWARD TYRELL.

It is unnecessary to make any further remark on these reports: they speak for themselves.

For several years before this time considerable apprehension was felt by Protestants in this country. Their uneasiness was increased by the expedition (March 18, 1708) of the 'Old Pretender,' James III., from Gravelines to Edinburgh. They feared at least, or they pretended to fear, that the disorder and rebellion, as they called it, would spread from Scotland to Ireland, and that all the meek, innocent, defenceless Irish Protestants would be massacred. And as they blamed the priests for being the instigators to all evil, they made the alleged danger a pretext for fresh persecution. This recrudescence of the *odium fidei* about the year 1709 is well known to historians. It is noticeable not only in some Acts of the second Parliament of Queen Anne but in unpublished documents of the time. For our purpose it will be sufficient to quote these two which are preserved in the Record Office, Dublin. Besides the information which they give about priests they show an application of the Statute which forbade Papists to have firearms:—

Maryborough, *the 20th of March, 1707.*

May it please y^r Ex^{es}

In pursuance to your Ex^{ies} commands signified to us by your Ex^{ies} Letter dated the 16th inst. wee immediately sent dispatches to all the officers commanding companies within the Queen's County to form themselves in the best & most expeditious manner that was possible for them, so that y^e said troops may be in a readiness to answer what y^r Exc^{ies} expect from them in case of danger, also to search all the houses of papists and sus-

pected persons, and to seize their arms, horses and all the popish priests and other disaffected persons, according to y^r Excell^{ies} Proclamation, which service is already performed throughout this county, and six of the Priests and some other suspected persons are now in custody, and wee expect all the rest will be brought in within a day or two, there are also some horses and arms seized, which are now in the hands of the Militia, there being but few papists in the County of much note, wee dont expect to find many horses or arms, yet our danger is allmost equal to any other county, by the great number of the meaner sort of Papists residing among us, for we cant compute the proportion less than twenty to one Protestant. [*Details about troops, etc.*] We shall be proud to receive the honour of y^r Excell^s further commands, and do remain with the greatest duty and respect

Y^r Exc^s most humble & most

servants

S. LEGER GILBERT.

EPHRAIM DAWSON.

1708

Com. Regis.

In obedience to thire Excell^s the Lord Justices & Councils several Directions and by virtue of her Maj^s commission of array to us and others Directed we having this 30th day of March 1708 met at Killoge in the said County agreed on the following several answers (viz^t)

That all the Popish Priests that inhabited the said County are committed except Thomas Perry who hath absconded.

There are but few serviceable horses belonging to Papists in the said County and what were are seized and no arms, but one long gunne, one case of pistols, and one sword belonging to Major Edmond Dayly, delivered to James Forth Esq., and one long gunne belonging to Col. John Connor and seized by John Moore, Esq.

We have agreed to raise nine Troops of Dragoons, each Troop to consist of fifty private men, besides Sergeants, Corporals, Drums & Officers servants, &c. &c.

In times such as these the light of faith shone brightest. Calamities only served to increase the flame. Notwithstanding the severity of the persecution our people could not be induced to abandon their religious practices, for they saw the beauty of truth and the deformity of error too

clearly. In defence of their faith they were prepared to undergo any hardship or to make any sacrifice, and no power of man or demon could force them to deny it. Even though in Dublin, more than in any other part of the country, Protestantism could use the arm of the law, yet all its efforts were unavailing. A MS. sent to Rome at this time, and still preserved in the Vatican Archives (Inn. X.), relates that on the preceding feast of St. John the Baptist a great many persons had gone barefoot in pilgrimage to his well outside the city (*St. John's Well, near Kilmainham*), among them being a Protestant woman who had received some mark of Divine mercy there. Priests also went for the purpose of preaching and administering the sacraments. But the soldiers were waiting for them at the well. Several Catholics (and the woman) were severely wounded, and all had to return as best they could. The MS. goes on to tell that a bigoted Protestant magistrate who lived near Lough Derg, not satisfied with the rigour of the laws, did all in his power by additional fines and punishments to put a stop to the pilgrimage. It appears that he acted in this manner because in spite of libellous pamphlets and calumnies of various kinds the devotion of the people to the pilgrimage of St. Patrick's Purgatory continued unabated.

Another proof of this devotion to a holy well is afforded by the following Proclamation, which is preserved in the Record Office, Dublin. It refers to the celebrated well near Dunshaughlin :—

WHARTON [Lord Lieutenant] 26 June 1710.

Whereas above ten thousand Papists are riotously assembled at a place commonly called St John's Well in the county of Meath, who under pretence of religious worship, may carry on dangerous designs to the great terror of her Majesty's Protestant subjects, and the endangering the public peace of this Kingdom, We taking into our consideration the many inconveniences that may arise from such tumults, and resolving to suppress such insolent practices, do hereby strictly charge and require the High-Sheriff of the County of Meath forthwith to raise the *Posse-Comitatus*, and to repair to the place aforesaid to disperse the said unlawful assembly, and to apprehend the leaders or

principal actors in the said riot, to the end that they may be prosecuted for the same with the utmost rigour of Law, &c., &c.

And the people who prayed at the holy wells of Ireland made every sacrifice in order to procure good Catholic education for their children. The very poor had, of course, to be content with the hedge-school, near which a boy was always stationed as sentinel in order to give timely notice of the approach of the magistrates and the soldiers. If the school was broken up one day, the scholars reassembled on the morrow. Thus, in spite of enactments and penalties, the poorest classes persevered in the love of learning, and knowledge sufficient for their humble station in life was handed down from generation to generation. Though all Irish Catholics at the time we speak of were poor, yet some had sufficient means to send their own sons or the sons of their more needy neighbours abroad in order to get a better education. For to have a priest in the family, to see him at the altar, to hear the Mass said by one of their own, was then, as now, the highest ambition and the greatest reward of the faithful Irish. It mattered not that the priest on his return would be proscribed and hunted down. Parents and sons were ready to endure everything for the love of God.

The Acts of Parliament passed in 1709 were stringent in the extreme. The secular priests that were registered could not exercise their functions outside the parishes for which they were registered, and they were not to have any successors. If any unregistered secular priest or any regular priest was arrested and convicted, the informer was entitled to twenty pounds reward. In the case of an Archbishop or Bishop, or of any other person having ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the reward was fifty pounds. Schoolmasters were liable to the same penalties as regular priests, i.e., to banishment, and if they returned to the punishment due to high treason. And those who concealed or harboured them were to be fined heavily: twenty pounds for the first offence, forty pounds for the second, confiscation of property for the third. One-half (not, however, a sum exceeding one hundred pounds) was to go to the informer. The legis-

lation against Catholics (the Act of Explanation, as it was entitled) was so inhuman that some members of the House of Lords, including King, the Archbishop of Dublin, protested. He gave a description of all the persecutions since the beginning of Christianity, and declared that he had never read of any one more barbarous and cruel. He added that the anger of God would fall on the nation for exacting from the Catholics so many perverse oaths ever since the reign of Charles II. This we learn from the letter of a student named Nicholas Plunkett which was forwarded by a priest named Fitzsimon living at the Hague, December 2, 1709.¹ But whatever penalties were inflicted on regulars and schoolmasters by this Act of Queen Anne, no attention was paid to them by the persons chiefly concerned. They were as little deterred from doing their duty as they were by the similar ones enacted by the Statute of 1695.² The following original documents from the Record Office will show instances of this. We may in passing observe that the hatred of Catholic education must have been intense, seeing that the same penalty was inflicted on the schoolmaster as on the regular priest. Their respective indictments are even found together:—

INDICTMENTS (2. B) 1706. 2 F. 16. 18.

Indictment 23.

The examination of Eustace Power who says that George Clancy (?) a reprobate friar assaulted him.

Indictment 33. (Billa vera Ber. Browne cum sociis.)

The examination of Richard Uniack of Swords in the County of Dublin, Schoolmaster, being duly examined before me the 2nd day of February 1705 saith as followeth.

That he hath known one Alexander Doyle, a Papist, to teach & keep schools these two years past and hath seen him actually teaching in the school in y^e Parish of Malahide and in the Parish of Portmarnock without the Lycense of y^e ordinary and contrary to y^e Act of Parliament and further saith not.

RICHD UNIACK.

Jurat coram me

Daniel Wybrant.

¹ Propaganda Archives, *Scritti originali*, vol. 569. ² 7 William III. c. 4.

The next document we shall quote is a petition from an informer. He deserved a double reward, for the person he made known was guilty of a twofold offence, viz., being a friar and having a school :—

To his Exc^y the Earl of Pembroke, L^d Lev^t Generall and Generall Govern^r of Ireland the humble Petition of Richard Pue Sheweth

That there is one Robert Robison (alies Brady) a native of Ireland born but long residing in France a Franciscan frier but now in Ireland under the notion of a Protestant : but at the same time exercises the Romish religion celebrating Mass & Confessing in Dublin he now teacheth a publick school of Latin Greek Logick and Philosophy, and is guilty of dangerous practices ; he hath been impeached by some worthy gent. but by his Jesawiticall policy baffles his accusers. There is one Mr. James Harper a Protestant living at Dicks coffee house in Skinnerow that is intimately connected with the s^d Frier and is said to be privy to his dangerous intreagues, of which the Pet^r is advised to acquaint y^r Excell^y fearing ill consequences from such persons and actings.

The pet^r humbly prayes y^r Ex to examine the s^d Mr harper, and enquire into the matter as y^r Ex in y^r great wisdom shall think fitt.

And y^r suppliant in bounden duty
will ever pray

(Enclosed).

SIR,

The petitioner desires not to be exposed unless Mr. Harper deny his knowledge of the s^d person, and his actions, which he communicated to the pet^r, and y^r Pet^r being in the nature of a servant in the hon. house of Commons urged Mr. Harper to apply to the house w^{ch} he promised but did not On w^{ch} the pet^r was advised to acquaint the Govern^t. The pet^r tho' attending severall times could not find a fitt opportunity to give the petⁿ to his Excellency, and not succeeding in that thought it proper to give it to y^r honour which the pet^r humbly hopes is the same thing (in effect) as if he had given it to his Excellency. (Endorsed. To be sent to ye Attorney Generall or Solicitor.)

(Press mark 8334 y. 4 Q. 129. 2.)

This petition is not dated. But we can assign the

limits of the period within which it was presented. The Earl of Pembroke was sworn in as Lord Lieutenant on June 24, 1707. The fact that Lords Justices were appointed on November 27 of same year shows that he left Ireland about the latter date. He was removed from office in 1708.

There is apparently nothing in the Record Office to show that Father Robison (*or* Brady) was banished, so we may trust that he was able afterwards to continue his teaching, even though for a time the school was closed.

In those days the alternative to a Catholic school and a heavy penalty was a Protestant school and a handsome pension. The proselytizers or *soupers* were as unscrupulous and as enterprising in the eighteenth century as they were in the nineteenth. The numerous Protestant societies were always prepared to buy children at a high price. If we could believe them, the expenditure was crowned with success, for 'crowds of young Papists were saved' and 'brands innumerable were snatched from the burning.' However, as their balance-sheets are proverbially untrue, we must be permitted to reject them and to retain our own convictions. Some unfortunates did fall away from the faith, but the fact that Ireland is Catholic to-day gives the lie to all such sweeping assertions. But while we reasonably decline to accept the reports of results issued by the above-mentioned societies, there can be no doubt whatever about the end they had in view, or rather the purpose for which they were established. To take an instance or two from what was done in Dublin:—

The Prospectus of the Incorporated Society stated publicly 'that King George II.'s principal Views in the charter granted to the Incorporated Society in Dublin, in 1733, were to train up the children of the poor natives in the Protestant religion, and in Labour and Industry, from their Infancy.' And the Almanack for 1766 contains an advertisement of St. Patrick's Hospital which says:—

The children admitted are those born of Popish parents, or such as would be bred Papists, if neglected, and are of sound Health and Limbs. Their Age from 6 to 10 years. They are

placed in schools remote from their former abode, and the boys at 16 and the girls at 14 years of age are apprenticed into Catholic families. Since the first opening of these schools, about 2,846 children have been so apprenticed.

The Society gives five pounds to every person educated in these schools, upon his or her marrying a Protestant. About 133 such portions have been paid.

Notwithstanding these and similar inducements the Irish remained steadfast. The hedge-school or the foreign seminary were preferred to all worldly possessions. The bribes proffered by the Protestants were spurned, and with reference to the tempters with their alleged treasures on the one hand, and its own unbending attitude towards them on the other, Catholic Ireland might well exclaim : ' *Beatum dixerunt populum cui haec sunt ; beata gens cujus est Dominus Deus ejus !* '

The prospective advantages of entrance into St. Patrick's Hospital, and all institutions like it, proved utterly unattractive. The people knew that its name was a lie, that the faith and works which St. Patrick taught were not to be found there. Again and again proofs are forthcoming that, in spite of dangers and difficulties, Catholics sent their sons to foreign colleges. For instance, a letter now in the Record Office, written in Castlemaine, Co. Kerry, on June 24, 1714, by two magistrates, John Blennerhassett and Joseph Kennington, to the Archbishop of Dublin (R. King), mentions with shame and sorrow and indignation the names of boys sent abroad for education. And another complaint is heard from Galway the year after :—

(Presentments. Grand Jury of the county of Galway, Lent Assizes, 29th March, 1715.)

That great numbers of the Catholic gentry were sending their sons abroad to receive foreign education ; that Ulick Burke, son to the Earl of Clanrickarde, and cousin to the Popish Archbishop of Tuam, was a-missing, he having been sent to France. That James Burke of Ower is a-missing, that he went out of this kingdom a year ago, and we are informed is in France ; so also is Hyacinth Nugent, son to Thomas Nugent, commonly called Lord Riverston, and many others.

Perhaps a sufficient number of instances has been quoted in illustration of the heroic readiness of Irish boys to leave their country for the sake of acquiring knowledge. Such everyday occurrences occasioned no surprise. Whereas, on the contrary, temporary unwillingness, real or apparent, to stay abroad was so rare, that the following episode deserves a place in these pages. We believe the narrative to be unique; at least nothing like it was found in the Record Office. We trust all our readers will sympathize with the irate *paterfamilias* and will mercifully excuse the expression into the use of which the warmth of his feelings betrayed him. In so far as it is the description, true to life, of a home scene in which a good father and a dutiful son appear, the narrative is interesting and amusing. The incident loses nothing, even if our knowledge of it is derived from a base informer.

1ST INDICTMENT.

The examination of Thomas Ffowler of the City of Dublin, Yeoman, taken before John Page, one of Her Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the County of the City of Dublin.

Who being duly sworn on the Holy Evangelists and examined deposeth yt this deponent had been acquainted these several years past with Patrick Howard of the City of Dublin, Baker, and well knew John Howard, his son, saith that the said John Howard, in or about the month of June, one thousand seven hundred and eight, having landed at Cork or some other port in this kingdom, from Ffrance, where his said father before then sent him to study and be educated in the Popish religion to be a priest or ffryer as this deponent credibly heard very [*sic.*, and verily ?] believes, and having come to Dublin his said ffather would not admit him into his presence for some time by reason he came from his studeys, till by friends he was prevailed on to be reconciled, and deposeth that the said Patrick Howard on discourse with his said son asked him what reason he had to leave his study, to which the said John Howard said he had a meagrim in his head, to which the said Patrick Howard replied Devil take you and your head, you are as well able to study as several of your neighbours' children and you have been very expensive to me and have had from me sixty pounds and more in money and clothes, and further deposeth that on or about the thirtieth day

of August, one thousand seven hundred and eight, the said Patrick Howard sent the said John Howard into France there to study and to be educated in the Popish religion, and at his going away furnished and supplied him with a new suit of clothes and wigg and other necessaries and also with money as the said Patrick Howard declared. This deponent further sayth yt on or about the thirtieth day of August aforesaid this deponent did see the said John Howard going down to Ringsend to goe aboard a ship in order afterwards to goe to Ffrance, this depõnt being then and for a considerable time before conversant in the said Patrick Howard's ffamily.

Jurat coram me

9^o die July 1709.

John Page.

Whether John Howard was subsequently ordained is more than we can say. We only know that there is every reason to believe that he never became a priest of the Dublin diocese or of the Dominican Order.

REGINALD WALSH, O.P.

ETHICAL PROBLEMS OF THE FUTURE—III

THE influence of the idea of evolution or development in the sphere of ethical science is not easily estimated.

The logical results that follow from the acceptance of the theory of biological evolution in connexion with the central problems of moral philosophy, the meaning of duty, obligation, and the moral law, have, in fact, been variously conceived. And it is no easy matter to unloosen the intricate tangle of speculation and to find clear, straight, logical issues amid the confusion. In Sidgwick we find an ethical writer of eminence strangely uninfluenced by this reigning scientific conception. Not that he overlooked its claims, but he had convinced himself that the results of the theory for ethical science had been misconceived and exaggerated. Nor is this an uncommon state of mind even in writers of what we may call the evolutionary period. Sidgwick himself notes in his diary an interesting remark of Jowett's: 'I talked of the idea of "development" as characteristic of the present age, and he (Jowett) said, "Don't you think it is the *word* rather than the *idea*," and would not believe that the development of political institutions could be traced at all.'¹ It is scarcely necessary nowadays to insist that the theory of evolution was not, as is popularly supposed, originated by Darwin. The notion was a common one long before his time, both in philosophy and science. Darwin's achievement consists in this: that he offered an explanation of *how* organic evolution might be conceived to have actually taken place. He suggested, as logicians say, a *vera causa*, or true cause of evolution; he supplied the working mechanism of the theory, so that where previous thinkers had said: 'Organic beings have evolved from simple to complex forms,' Darwin added: 'They have so evolved through the working of environ-

¹ Henry Sidgwick: *A Memoir*, p. 346.

mental selection, or the survival of the fittest.' Our task at present is to discover the ethical bearings of this evolutionary theory.

Herbert Spencer has developed an elaborate system of morality upon the basis of evolution, which is of the greatest interest for anyone who would determine the lines of ethical tendency. In fact, he regards this ethical theory as in a sense the most important result of his 'Synthetic Philosophy,' and tells us in his ponderous way that his 'ultimate purpose lying behind all proximate purposes has been that of finding for the principles of right and wrong, in conduct at large, a scientific basis.'¹ He realized that the establishment of the rules of right conduct upon an evolutionary basis was a 'pressing need.' Since the older theories had (as he thought) lost their meaning, and the view of the world upon which they were based had ceased to influence the scientific mind, the need for a coherent, logical system of moral rules grounded upon the evolutionary theory had become imperative.

Now that moral injunctions are losing the authority given by their supposed sacred origin, the secularization of morals is becoming imperative. Few things can happen more disastrous than the decay and death of a regulative system no longer fit before another and fitter regulative system has grown up to replace it. Most of those who reject the current creed appear to assume that the controlling agency furnished by it may safely be thrown aside, and the vacancy left unfilled by any other controlling agency. Meanwhile, those who defend the current creed allege that in the absence of the guidance it yields, no guidance can exist: divine commandments they think the only possible guides. Thus between these extreme opponents there is a certain community. The one holds that the gap left by the disappearance of the code of supernatural ethics need not be filled by a code of natural ethics; and the other holds that it cannot be so filled. Both contemplate a vacuum which the one wishes and the other fears.²

A keen appreciation of the niceties of opposing ethical

¹ *Data of Ethics*, Preface.

² *Principles of Ethics*, vol. i. p. viii.

systems was not a strong point with Spencer. The choice seems to him to lie between his own system, which, with rare modesty, he entitles 'scientific ethics,' and some rather vague theory which derives the obligatory character of morality from the arbitrary fiat of the Divine will, and which he calls 'supernatural ethics.' Happily there are other possibilities. Spencer clearly recognizes, however, that there is necessary a scientific theory of morality from the evolutionary standpoint, that what he calls the 'vacuum' must somehow be filled. He does not, perhaps, realize that the filling of it may require the feat of an evolutionary Curtius!

In estimating ethical theories of the evolutionary type it is important to keep in mind the distinction between the historical development of ethical principles and the binding force of these principles here and now for the conscience of an enlightened evolutionist—in a word, we must constantly remember the difference between what Professor Sorley has happily called the 'evolution of ethics' and the 'ethics of evolution.' The evolution theory claims to have penetrated and transformed every sphere of experience. And just as living organisms are subject to development, so moral principles have themselves grown up in the course of the life-history of the race; they have been evolved and developed out of rudimentary moral ideas of our remote savage ancestors. Each gradual accumulation has been transmitted from one generation to another, in the modified inherited structure of brain and nervous tissue. Spencer's entire system rests upon a peculiar view of this transmission, often called the Lamarck-Darwin theory or the theory of 'use-inheritance.' It regards organic evolution as due at least in part to the inheritance of 'functionally-produced modifications'; it maintains that what are called 'acquired characteristics' are transmitted from parent to offspring; that the son of a blacksmith, to use a crude illustration, may inherit, not merely the congenital or germinal peculiarities of his parent—such things as build of body, cast of features, colour of hair, and so on—but also his 'acquired characteristics,' such as a certain development of the arm

muscles. Clearly, the ethical gains of the parent should be transmitted, largely if not entirely, after this fashion. That deeper insight into moral truths, that finer appreciation of right and wrong, coming to the parent as a moral discovery, would leave its subtle mark and stamp upon his nervous mechanism, and be handed on as a parental acquirement to the offspring. This theory of the inheritance of acquired characteristics is, however, subject to the gravest difficulties, and is nowadays generally rejected by biologists. It suffers at once from the negative defect of lack of evidence in its favour, and from the positive defect that it is impossible to understand how these acquired characters could affect the germ-cells and so succeed in getting themselves transmitted. Spencer's account of the development of moral ideas in the individual and in the race is, however, most intimately bound up with this theory of 'use-inheritance,' and to a large extent collapses with it.

Apart altogether from this scientific aspect of the problem the theory of the evolutionary development of moral truths is replete with difficulty. The analogy between organic evolution and the evolution of truth has a certain superficial plausibility. But when we think the matter out logically we find that moral principles, just in so far as they are truths, could not have an evolutionary history. We may, indeed, trace the history of their accidental occurrence in this or that mind, or their influence upon society at any stage of its development. But the truth itself just (as we say) *quâ* truth has had no evolutionary development. It cannot arise piecemeal. If present at all, it is present completely; it is incapable of growth. Like the child-spirit in Thompson's lines, it is 'unfurled not from an embryo' but 'born of full stature.' We cannot conceive a truth such as 'two and two are four' gradually developing in the course of evolutionary history. The insight into the truth must have come at some stage as a sudden and novel factor—the only evolutionary explanation of its occurrence being apparently something like that given by Mill for the villainous mathematics of the 'distant stellar regions,' namely, that it somehow 'interloped.'

If we grant, however, that moral principles and ideas have had such an evolutionary history as Spencer supposes, an account of this history, however thorough, is not yet an ethical system. It furnishes us with an account of the 'Evolution of Ethics,' a genetic history of moral ideas. The question still remains: What is to be thought of the *value* of moral principles? Do these moral laws, with whose history we have been made acquainted, exert any moral compulsion upon us here and now? Have they a commanding power which the intellect is prepared to acknowledge? Can reasons be given why we should obey them if we find ourselves not so inclined? In a word, can there be a scientific 'Ethics of Evolution,' a system of morals founded upon the evolutionary world-theory? Spencer not unfrequently confuses these two problems, which are, however, quite separate and distinct. He often seems to think that when he has given us some account of the manner in which moral principles have developed from indefiniteness, and incoherence, and homogeneity, up to definiteness, and coherence, and heterogeneity, his task is accomplished. In reality, the vital question has not yet been raised. The nerve of the difficulty consists just in the problem of the binding force of these moral principles for the enlightened conscience. How a sentiment or feeling of obligation has come to be connected with them in the minds of the multitude is an interesting question in sociological psychology, but it furnishes no answer to the genuinely ethical problem: Why should I (the supposed scientific evolutionist) obey them? What is the source of their obligation to one who knows precisely what they mean, and how they have come about?

This distinction is of all the more importance since it enables us to understand a fundamental peculiarity in Spencer's ethical system. He distinguishes between what he calls 'Absolute Ethics' and 'Relative Ethics.' 'Relative Ethics' has to do with the moral law as it appears in the present stage of the world's development. This, however, is but one stage amongst many, and just as it has been preceded by many less evolved stages so will it be succeeded

by many more evolved. It has no element of finality ; imperfection is of its very nature ; it is something to be transcended and overpassed. Everything, therefore, points to the ultimate most evolved state of the race as the ethical ideal, the sphere for a complete and perfect ethics, and it is with this ultimate state that 'Absolute Ethics' has to deal. In fact it becomes clear when we view conduct from 'the evolution point of view' that far from affording support to moral principles as we now find them, it tends to a greater or less extent to undermine them. The present is but a stage in a great progress, and is marked by relative confusion, disorder, 'imperfect adjustment' in its moral principles. These principles have a certain force for the multitude ; a feeling of obligation has grown up in connexion with them, but their imperfection is evident to the scientific evolutionist. The difficulty raised by this incompleteness, in the sphere of practical morality, is deeper than Spencer is prepared to admit, and it of course tends to increase as knowledge of the evolution-theory becomes more widely diffused. Such being the truth about our present moral code we can seek ultimate moral value only in the highest stage which the evolution of humanity will assume, and here unhappily the sentiment of moral obligation which necessarily implies imperfect adjustment to environment will (so Spencer, not without triumph informs, us) have completely disappeared.

What the nature of this ultimate stage of development will be we can (Spencer thinks) gather at least in outline from the general trend of the evolutionary progress so far. Our knowledge about it is, and will remain, decidedly limited. We live at a stage of development whose imperfection we painfully realize (though obviously it is an imperfection just fitted for that stage), and we get imperfect glimpses of a future state of complete perfection, of a state of society, of which Spencer tells us comprehensively that in it every action will 'produce pleasure unalloyed by pain anywhere,' but in which we can never hope to participate. Our moral outlook is divided between this ultimate utopian state of society, with which we have no concern, and the present

imperfectly adjusted state which we can scarcely actively modify. What precise 'survival-value' this unhappy knowledge can have, why we should be so evolved as to misspend energy in convincing ourselves of the imperfect nature of a system of moral rules which at the present stage cannot be replaced, is a question one does not care to face. There is no inspiration in Spencer's moral ideal. The final stage of human development will come about inevitably, and independently of any effort upon our part. Whether it really is a desirable condition it would be difficult to say. But if we can accept all that Spencer tells us about it, it seems to have rather undesirable aspects. Many persons, for example, might feel dissatisfied with the almost complete abolition of field sports, such as hunting and football, that Spencer seems to contemplate, or with his condemnation of so innocent a source of enjoyment as chess. No one would object to his insistence on the moral aspects of bodily health, rest, nutrition, and so forth, if he did not fatuously imagine that he has been the first to discover this moral aspect. And however delighted what we might call in Spencerian language 'straight' men might feel when informed that, 'from the point of view of absolute ethics,' stimulants of every kind, tea and coffee as well as alcohol, or 'at any rate the daily use of them' must be 'reprobated'—if they had any pretensions to logical training, they could scarcely be satisfied with the reason for the 'reprobation,' which is a glaring *petitio principii*. Upon the whole, this absolute stage seems admirably accommodated to a peculiar Spencerian type of human being, displaying many of the peculiarities, not always lovable, that one gleans from his amazingly egotistical *Autobiography*.

To sum up: The uncertainty of this ideal state, its distance, its undesirable character, the fact that we know nothing about it except by a tremendous act of faith in the preternatural acuteness or prophetic insight of its author or discoverer, and above all (for human egotism will ever claim its own) the fact that we have no hope of personally participating in it, tend to make it useless for ethical purposes. It

merely mocks us with the imagination of a 'horizon-line of desirability.'

We pass on to the problem of how much can be gleaned from our knowledge of the laws of the evolution-process as to the nature of the moral end and the working of the moral criterion. Spencer very justly concludes that, viewing the question from the standpoint of evolution, the *actual* aim of the evolutionary striving in living beings must be conceived as life 'taken both in length and in breadth.' The aim of the cosmical struggle, so far as living beings are concerned, is the maintenance and increase of life. He shows by an admirable comparison of life at various stages of development that the end of the evolution-process is to produce not so much length of life as depth, complication, or increase of vital activities. It is naïve to suppose that Spencer can be refuted by reference to the longevity of elephants or the mighty digestive, circulatory, and locomotor activities of some of the larger mammals. Spencer tells us that the evolution of conduct,

besides being an improving adjustment of acts to ends, such as furthers prolongation of life, it is such as furthers increased amount of life. Reconsideration of the examples above given will show that length of life is not by itself a measure of evolution of conduct, but that quantity of life must be taken into account. An oyster, adapted by its structure to the diffused food contained in the water it draws in, and shielded by its shell from nearly all dangers, may live longer than a cuttle-fish, which has such superior powers of dealing with numerous contingencies; but then the sum of vital activities during any given interval is far less in the oyster than in the cuttle-fish. So a worm, ordinarily sheltered from most enemies by the earth it burrows through, which also supplies a sufficiency of its poor food, may have greater longevity than many of its annulose relatives, the insects; but one of these, during its existence as larva and imago, may experience a greater quantity of the changes which constitute life. Nor is it otherwise when we compare the more evolved with the less evolved among mankind. The difference between the average lengths of the lives of savage and civilized is no true measure of the difference between the totalities of their two lives, considered as aggregates of thought, feeling, and

action. Hence, estimating life by multiplying its length into its breadth, we must say that the augmentation of it which accompanies evolution of conduct, results from increase of both factors. The more multiplied and varied adjustments of acts to ends, by which the more developed creature from hour to hour fulfils more numerous requirements, severally add to the activities that are carried on abreast, and severally help to make greater the period through which such simultaneous activities endure.¹

This is an admirable example of Spencer's method at its best. Obviously a wide inductive survey convinces one that this must be the purpose of evolutionary striving— increase of the intensity, the depth of life, enlargement of the range of vital activity in a way compatible with the renewal of force. If life in such a sense be regarded as the end, no one could hesitate to regard human life as the ideal. In richness, in complexity, in variety, in manifoldness of vital activities it far surpasses the lives of the lower animals. As M. Guyau admirably suggests,

la pensée est l'une des formes principales de l'activité humaine : non, comme l'avait cru Aristote parce que la pensée serait l'acte pur et dégagé de toute matière (hypothèse inverifiable), mais parce que la pensée est, pour ainsi dire, de l'action condensée et de la vie à son maximum de développement.

To the evolutionist who views the facts of life simply as facts, who considers human conduct merely as a part of the wider whole of conduct in general, it must seem inevitable that life in some such sense is the *actual* end of the evolution-process. Spencer goes on, however, to the further conclusion that life is also the *moral* end. This is a statement with quite a new meaning—a meaning which certainly does not follow from the general line of argument adopted. The moral end is the end which an ethical being necessarily conceives as alone desirable. And it may very well be that upon examination we should find life not worth living, entirely undesirable and ultimately making no appeal to anyone who knows what it is and how much it offers.

¹ *Principles of Ethics*, pp. 14, 15.

Granted that evolution tends to the maintenance of life, it does not follow that a rational being who 'looks before and after' will find himself under a moral compulsion to consciously select this same end. The cosmical process may tend to the survival of the fittest, but the fittest is not the morally best but the most aptly accommodated to the environment. And the environment may be such as to demand an inferior type. To conditions which forbid life, as Bosanquet somewhere remarks, a corpse is better accommodated than a living man. Spencer is not unaware of this difficulty, though he scarcely can be said to keenly realize it :—

On the answer to this question [Is life worth living ?] depends entirely every decision concerning the goodness or badness of conduct. By those who think life is not a benefit but a misfortune, conduct which prolongs it is to be blamed rather than praised : the ending of an undesirable existence being the thing to be wished, that which causes the ending of it must be applauded, while actions furthering its continuance, either in self or others, must be reprobated.¹

Spencer, however, thinks that he can justify an optimistic outlook upon life, that he can show that testing life by the criterion of pleasure and pain the balance is in favour of pleasure. The basis of this view is again a sweeping induction in Spencer's usual manner. Viewing the evolution-process in living beings, he thinks he can conclude universally that pleasure-giving acts always tend to the maintenance of life, and on the other hand that 'life-sustaining acts' are invariably pleasurable. Obviously, any animal taking pleasure in a type of action tending to the destruction of life could not survive. In this way Spencer is able to identify maximum of life (in his sense) with maximum of pleasure, and thus his moral end seems to become identical with that of the utilitarian. Even this conclusion, if justified (which in detail it is not), does not quite meet the situation. It must still be taken as intuitively evident that pleasure is desirable, or, in other words,

¹ *Principles of Ethics*, vol. i. p. 26.

that the moral man is under an ethical obligation to select it. Ethics can never be purely factual, but must contain at least one fundamentally ethical principle or imperative.

Spencer now seems to have reached a conclusion which practically identifies his ethical theory with hedonism. This, however, is not the case. The evolutionary standpoint gives him (at least so he supposes) a most important advantage over the hedonist. The method or criterion of hedonism is, as we have already noted, an empirical calculation of pleasures—in its essence an inductive method. Spencer's method is deductive. Since he has demonstrated (at least to his own satisfaction) that the evolution of life is constantly in the pleasurable direction, he can deduce the moral laws from the general laws of the evolution of life, and hence can make utilitarianism deductive. This would seem, in theory, a very great advance, for the empirical criterion of pleasure is hopelessly unworkable because of its complexity.¹

Such, in outline, is the ethical theory of Spencer. When we ask ourselves what support it affords to morality, as ordinarily conceived, the answer cannot be doubtful. We have already seen that Spencer regards the moral law in its present state as incomplete, incorrect, and fragmentary. And the corrections and emendations of it which he himself suggests are marked, not so much by originality or brilliancy of conception as rather by an insistence upon details suggested by his personal idiosyncrasies. It becomes evident that in no system of ethics more clearly than in the ethics of evolution are we confronted with the questions: What is the ground of moral obligation? and, What is the nature of the moral law that we are bound to obey? And in fact there have been formulated in recent times ethical theories which, working upon the general evolutionary basis, clearly present the true logical issues. The keen and brilliant little book of M. Guyau entitled *Esquisse d'une Morale sans Obligation ni Sanction* sufficiently declares its purpose in

¹ See *Autobiography*, vol. ii. p. 89, where Spencer's well-known letter to Stuart Mill containing an admirable summary of his ethical system is quoted.

its title. It sketches, with marvellous felicity of illustration and at the same time with rare logical acuteness, a theory of morals founded upon evolution, but dispensing altogether with the idea of obligation or duty. In the ethical works of Nietzsche, whose unsystematic form and frequent extravagance of expression conceal a closely-knit logical theory, the complementary tendency is noticeable. His purpose is to show that the notion of the moral law in the Christian sense is altogether different from the moral law which an enlightened evolutionist, thoroughly conversant with human origins, would sketch out for himself. The former is a 'slave-morality,' resting ultimately upon the notion of sympathy or charity towards the weak. The true moral ideal is that which the course of the evolutionary striving, ever tending to eliminate the unfit and to develop and maintain the strong, puts before us. The weak are going to the wall, and let us help to push them towards it. What evolution inevitably points to is an 'aristocratic morality,' the development of the strong, of the highest type of human animal, in a word of the 'Superman.' The cosmical process, as Huxley pointed out, is the very reverse of moral in the Christian sense. Then, says Nietzsche, we, the select, the strong, require to be thoroughly egotistical. 'Life itself is essentially appropriating, injuring, and vanquishing of what is foreign and weak: it is suppression, severity, obtrusion of its own forms, incorporation, and at least, putting it most mildly, exploitation . . . life itself is Will to Power.'¹

And if it be objected that human evolution has developed altruism as an important uniting bond in social life—this may be admitted, but it must be urged that now we, the enlightened, who know the inner working of the process, must come to see that all this talk about self-sacrifice is, to put it bluntly, 'a got-up business'—reasons for justifying it are not to be discovered now that 'God is dead.' When once we grasp the fact that the evolutionary ideal is an ideal for the strong, that 'the violent bear it away,' it soon becomes evident that the older type of morals is in need of

¹ *Beyond Good and Evil*, § 259.

radical reform. Nothing will meet the exigencies of the situation but a 'breaking of the old tables' and a 'transvaluation of all values.' 'What is good? All that elevates the feeling of power, the power itself in man. What is bad? All that proceeds from weakness.' The Christian commandment of love and charity is replaced by the Nietzschean: 'This new table, my brethren, I put up for you: Become hard.' The worth of the unselfish spirit, the self-denying, self-sacrificing instincts is a question which the evolutionist familiar with 'nature red in tooth and claw' may well ask himself. 'We require a criticism of moral valuations—the value of these valuations has itself first to be called in question—and for that purpose a knowledge is necessary of the conditions and circumstances out of which they have grown.'¹

His account of the origin and growth of the Christian spirit is undoubtedly the crudest and weakest part of Nietzsche's work, reminding one somewhat of the eighteenth-century idea that religion was invented by priests for their personal aggrandizement. The suppressed, the down-trodden, and the weak have simply invented this system of morals as a protection against the noble and the strong, fabricated these ideals in the 'gloomy workshop' of their necessities, 'prompted by the revengeful craft of impotence.'

Such, in briefest outline, is the Nietzschean moral theory in which genius is strangely blended with extravagance, and logical conclusiveness with wild, unbridled passion. Not unfrequently we note a passing outburst of that insanity which later caught him in its awful grip—a fierce spasm of maniacal hatred for Christianity, a bitter cynicism that reminds one of the darker thoughts of Swift. But we cannot overlook the fundamental energy of his thought nor fail to see that his theories will claim the notice of the future.

Guyau is not so much concerned with the content of morality as with its supposed binding character—its obligation and sanction. The difficulty that the theory of

¹ *Genealogy of Morals*, §§ 5, 6.

evolution here brings to light has already been emphasized. The evolution-process would have done its work admirably had it not somehow evolved a moral critic—a being that has penetrated into the secret of the cosmos, that

Sifts in his hands the stars, weighs them as gold-dust ;
And yet is he successive unto nothing,
But patrimony of a little mould
And entail of four planks.

We find ourselves part of a mighty process of development, fragmentary items of an immense totality, whose evolutionary history we can trace, at least, in outline. A feeling of necessity to adopt certain lines of action is an undoubted fact of our consciousness. This, too, has its history. We know (being *ex hypothesi* scientific evolutionists) that we are in all respects the result of forces that, with sufficient knowledge, could be calculated and reduced to scientific formulæ. The play of cosmical energies, environmental and others, have produced this curious result—a being aware of the whole grim business, thoroughly conscious (for he has proved it scientifically) that he is only a stage in an inevitable evolution, a meeting-point of forces. (The very consciousness, or at least the proof, that he is such a being seems to involve a contradiction, for does it not necessitate, at least, a logical freedom of reasoning?) And now the ethical question urges: What is to be thought of the value of this feeling of obligation? Can it have a place in a reasoned theory of morality? Here the negative answer cannot be avoided. To one who is merely a result of forces (one remembers how Green insisted upon this point) an injunction to conform to their laws is utterly meaningless. Obligation as an ethical notion, as a concept of a scientific morality, completely disappears. The morality of any time, of any person even, is an inevitable result of the forces then and there at work. Just as in Spencer's utopian stage, the adjustment of all beings will be so perfect that every action will inevitably produce 'pleasure unalloyed by pain anywhere,' and even the feeling of obligation will have vanished, so in the earlier stages, though the *feeling* of obligation per-

forms a useful function for the multitude, still it has no place in a logical system of ethics. It is an epiphenomenal accompaniment of action—never an intellectual if sometimes an emotional dynamic. Guyau's theory springs simply from a clear insight into this fact. It is an insistence upon the important truth that the idea of obligation, in the truly ethical sense, cannot be justified at any stage of the evolutionary development. Action springs from life as so far developed, from fecundity of life, of intellect, of emotion, of will. Life is at once its source and its end. To Guyau morality is a result of life, the flower of vital action :—

C'est ainsi que la vie devient désir ou crainte, peine ou plaisir, en vertu même de sa force acquise et des primitives directions où l'évolution l'a lancée. Une fois connue l'intensité de vie chez un être avec les diverses issues ouvertes à son activité, on peut prédire la direction que cet être se sentira intérieurement poussé à prendre.¹

Life takes its moral colour from the primitive direction in which evolution has flung it. Did we but know the intensity of life in any being and the various issues that its environment presents, we could foretell the direction which this being will feel itself inwardly obliged to take. There is really no question of free moral selection :—

Chacun de nous sent en lui une sorte de poussée de la vie morale, comme de la sève physique. Vie, c'est fécondité, et réciproquement la fécondité, c'est la vie à pleins bords, c'est la véritable existence. Il y a une certaine générosité inséparable de l'existence, et sans laquelle on meurt, on se dessèche intérieurement. Il faut fleurir ; la moralité, le désintéressement, c'est la fleur de la vie humaine.²

Thus moral action comes from a kind of pushing of the moral life, like that of the physical sap. We must put forth blossoms ; morality, disinterestedness, is the flower of human life. Duty is simply the consciousness of a certain inward

¹ *Esquisse, etc.*, 10th edition, p. 92.

² *Ibid.* p. 101.

power, a feeling of what one is capable of doing, of a superabundance of life which demands to exercise, to impart itself. The entire theory is compressed into the following neat reference: 'A man celebrated for his courage and integrity (Daumesnil) said, one day, to a minister of Charles X., "I do not follow my conscience; I am driven by it."'

It is necessary to conclude. I am not without a feeling that these essays may in many minds have provoked ardent reflections upon the singular inappropriateness of their title. They seem to deal largely with the ethics of the *past*. Yet I am not without hope that that past must be considered, as Leibniz put it, as 'big with the future.' In all the ethical systems we have considered, it is remarkable how the emphasis of speculation constantly rests upon the same central problems. True, in the English writers the issues are not faced in the same buoyant manner as by Nietzsche and Guyau. The old leaven of English orthodoxy and propriety is still very evident. With Mill and Sidgwick in addition there is a genuine appreciation of the value of Christian hope. Spencer would willingly enough appear an advanced thinker, but somehow he inevitably produces the impression of a righteous puritan masquerading in the borrowed weeds of science. Ethical radicality does not sit lightly upon him. It is too self-conscious with him to be regarded as what psychologists would call secondarily-automatic. One will remember the amusing egotism of the story in the *Autobiography* (I cannot at present trace it) of the Scotch minister who was horrified at finding that he was stopping in the same hotel as Herbert Spencer! This is rationalistic self-conceit with a vengeance, all the more interesting because thoroughly naïve. Guyau and Nietzsche, on the other hand, quite take things for granted. Moreover, they have a brilliancy of style which makes an appeal to a wider circle than that of merely professional students of philosophy. The literary form of the aphorism which Nietzsche frequently employs has great advantages from a popular point of view. Indeed, if one may judge from recent literature the modern mind seems to require the artificial stimulus of paradox to rouse it from its 'dogmatic or

undogmatic slumber.' Nietzsche is a past master in this dangerous art. He constantly throws his thoughts into that delightful form which requiring to be completed by the inferential work of the reader flatters him with the idea of creative activity. I can only just refer to the important influence exercised by the thought of Nietzsche upon popular literature. Already, too, its influence is traceable in English ethical works, as, for example, Professor Taylor's *Problem of Conduct*. The Nietzschean ethics, however, requires a more extended treatment than I can give it here, and I must postpone its consideration to some future time.

D. O'KEEFFE.

PRE-REFORMATION ARCHBISHOPS OF CASHEL¹

IT is pleasant to find a love of Irish ecclesiastical history animating the present generation, and it is devoutly to be hoped that the foundation of the Irish Catholic Record Society will be loyally and cordially supported to such an extent that it may be enabled to issue at least one large volume annually. Meantime, the Protestant clergy and laity are up and doing; and within recent years we have had several important books on diocesan history written by Canon Healy, Canon Lawler, Rev. J. B. Leslie, Mr. H. T. Knox, and others. The object of the present paper is to give an extended notice of a recently published book on the pre-Reformation Archbishops of Cashel, from the pen of Rev. St. John D. Seymour, B.D., Rector of Donohill (Cappawhite). Let it be said at once that the matter of the book is fairly satisfactory, and good use has been made of the works of Ware, Cotton, Brady, Gams, and Eubel, as also the Calendars of Papal Registers, State Papers, Patent Rolls, and Close Rolls, but we cannot commend the way in which the facts are presented nor the manifest bias throughout. In not a few places, too, implicit credence has been given to the writings of Rev. Robert King. However, it is satisfactory to find Lynch's MS. History of the Irish Church quoted, also Fleming's *Collectanea* (1667) and Rev. Dr. Carrigan's *History of the Diocese of Ossory*. Curiously enough, Rev. Dr. MacCaffrey's *Black Book of Limerick* is omitted in the list of authorities consulted, although quoted in the body of the book.

In his Introduction the author writes as follows:—

Just one word by way of warning. The reader may possibly lay these pages down with the impression that the majority of

¹ *Pre-Reformation Archbishops of Cashel*. By St. John D. Seymour, B.D., author of *Succession of Clergy in Cashel and Emly*. Dublin: Church of Ireland Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd.

these pre-Reformation Archbishops were either notoriously wicked or else mere nonentities. This, however, is not a correct view of the case. Many of these prelates must have endeavoured to the best of their ability to uphold the ideal of their high office, and by means of it to lead their flocks in the way of righteousness. Of such no account remains in any *earthly* Record Office. It must be borne in mind as well that the very nature of the documents through which we have searched precludes the mention of what may be termed purely spiritual work. The Papal Regesta and the various Rolls, when they do not contain notices of election and confirmation, merely record instances of appeals to Rome, or of lawsuits in which the Archbishops were plaintiffs or defendants. These documents put forward one side, and that not always a pleasant or creditable one, of a prelate's life; there was another and a better side of which, as a rule, only a glimpse is vouchsafed us here and there.

The strange part of it is that, after this quasi-apologia, we are merely presented with the side of the documents that often gives the appearance of unsavoury conduct on the part of the Archbishops concerned. After all, it is best to quote the documents—let the whole truth be known; but we do most strenuously object to glossing them according to the author's whim. And why read into the documents a sense that is not there? Thus in one case (page 23), referring to a statement made on the authority of King, we read in regard to Margaret le Blunde's petition to the king: 'If her story be true, *and it is to be feared it was.*' Again (page 35), commenting on the clause in the restitution of temporalities to Archbishop O'Carroll in 1303, we read: 'Why were such elaborate precautions taken in this case? Was it that facts had come to light to his detriment, or was it that the name of MacCarwell [*sic*] had become a *synonym for all that was lawless, cruel, and rebellious, and thus was calculated to inspire terror, even in the breasts of kings?*' Surely no serious historian would dream of elaborating the real state of affairs from casual entries in the Patent Rolls or the Justiciary Rolls. As well might one write, or attempt to write, the social history of Ireland in the nineteenth century from the advertisements in the

Hue and Cry, or proclamations in the *Dublin Gazette*, or from the pleadings in the law courts.

But it will be best to take the present work in chronological order, and to point out what appears worthy of attention, as also to note some blunders, not a few of which are inexcusable. At the same time it is only fair to say that the author has gleaned a surprisingly full summary of the 'documented' evidence in regard to the see of Cashel from the twelfth to the middle of the sixteenth century—yet with the addition, as has been said, of a gloss of his own, according to recognized Protestant views.

The account of the Synod of Fiadh-mic-Aengusa, as credited to Keating, is not the same as given in Father Dinneen's excellent edition of that great Irish historian (volume iii.); and it is remarkable that no account is given of the consecration of 'Cormac's Chapel' in 1134.

Mr. Seymour is in error in supposing that 'M. Scot' who was offered the see of Cashel in 1224 was 'Matthew Scott, to whom, in 1218, the Pope ordered the University of Paris to grant the degree of Master of Theology which they had previously refused him.' A reference to the Papal Registers makes sufficiently clear that the Master M. Scot who had declined the see of Cashel as being ignorant of the Irish language was the famous Michael Scot whose name is well known in connexion with sorcery.

Concerning Archbishop O'Brien it is said that 'for some unknown reason he refused to confirm the election of the Bishop of Emly, until directed by the Pope to do so.' Surely Mr. Seymour must have overlooked the statement in the State Papers that the King of England had refused to confirm the election, *by order of the Pope*. Finally the Archbishop consecrated the Bishop of Emly, and the king restored the temporalities on June 25, 1230.

In reference to Archbishop O'Grady, who ruled from 1331 to 1345, it is stated that Edward III. granted him the advowson of the wealthy rectory of Dungarvan, Co. Waterford, but it might have been added that the same monarch, in 1360, conferred the advowson on the Earl of Desmond. Mr. Seymour adds that the Archbishop 'made a journey to

Rome, in 1343,' but the Papal Regesta leave no room for doubt that this visit was not to Rome but to Avignon, where Pope Clement VI. conferred many favours on him. We are grateful, however, for the quotation from Archdeacon Lynch as to the pastoral staff of Archbishop O'Grady, a fragment of which, after many vicissitudes, was given to Archbishop Slattery, who had it inserted in the archiepiscopal crozier now in the museum of St. Patrick's College, Thurles. We are also grateful for the interesting account of the image of Our Lady of Graces, from Lynch, who quoted it from Father Patrick Fleming's rare book, *Collectanea Sacra*, compiled in the third decade of the seventeenth century, and edited by Father Thomas Sheerin in 1667. Fleming's account of the miraculous image of Our Lady of Graces is not to be found in O'Heyne's *Irish Dominicans*, edited by Father A. Coleman, O.P., and therefore Lynch's version of it is especially valuable. It appears that this image had always been worn by Archbishop O'Carroll; and that when on visitation (as Metropolitan) of the diocese of Cloyne he fell sick at Youghal, where he died in the Dominican Friary of that town, at the close of March, 1316. More than a century later it was found in his tomb, as attested by Father James Forest, who was told of it by his master, Ulick de Burgo. This image was placed in a beautiful shrine made by order of Lady Honor FitzGerald in 1617.¹ Archdeacon Lynch is further drawn on for the information that Archbishop O'Grady—who died on July 18, 1345—was buried in the Dominican Friary, Cashel, and not, as stated by Ware and his copyists, in Limerick. This fact is attested by the 'Black Book' of the Dominican Friars of Cashel, a valuable MS. that is not now forthcoming.

Although the two familiar stories are dished up afresh in regard to Archbishop O'Kelly, who was appointed to Cashel on January 9, 1346, there is no mention of his visit to the Papal Court at Avignon, where he secured many favours, in 1358. Again does the author quote from King

¹ This shrine is now in the Dominican Priory, Cork, encased in an outer covering designed by Goldie, of London, in 1872.

as to the treatment accorded to Archbishop O'Carroll by the Bishop of Limerick. This incident he dates as occurring in the year 1369. The thrilling narrative in regard to this Archbishop is a palpable error, as the dispute did not occur till the close of the year 1374, under Philip Torrington, an English Franciscan friar, who had been appointed Archbishop—in succession to Archbishop O'Carroll—on September 5, 1373. Inasmuch as Torrington did not receive restitution of temporalities until September 6, 1374, the friction between him and Bishop Curragh of Limerick did not occur till after that date. Archbishop Torrington was appointed conservator of the privileges of the Franciscan Order in Ireland, and he wished to infringe on the rights of the secular clergy, a proceeding which was naturally resented by the Bishop of Limerick, whose predecessor had a short time before translated the remains of the great Irish Primate, Richard FitzRalph, from Avignon to Dundalk. Had Mr. Seymour consulted such an accessible book as Father Begley's *Diocese of Limerick*—a book unnoticed in his 'list of authorities consulted'—he would have found not only a synopsis of the dispute but the whole Latin letter, dated 13 Kal. Sept., 1376, written by Pope Gregory XI. to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom the dispute was referred. Father Begley adds that the Bishop of Limerick must have made a satisfactory explanation, for he was appointed on a Papal commission in the following year. Nor does Mr. Seymour tell us that Archbishop Torrington left Ireland in 1376, and never returned, and we know from the Papal Regesta that the Bishop of Emly—who was Papal Nuncio—administered the diocese of Cashel from 1376 to 1381, when Peter Hackett was appointed.

In reference to Archbishop Hackett (1381-1406) it is stated that 'owing to the scarcity of records concerning this immediate period *nothing further is known about him except that he died in 1406.*' As a matter of fact, a glance at the Index of the *Calendar of Papal Registers* will show that Archbishop Hackett was held in high esteem by the reigning Popes and acted on several important commissions.

It is most probable that he died in January, 1406, for Richard O'Hayden, Archdeacon of Cashel, was appointed his successor in the following April, and was then, evidently, in Rome.

Details regarding Archbishop John Cantwell were only recently accessible, and therefore Mr. Seymour's unacquaintance with them is excusable. He was a B.C.L. of Oxford, and was appointed Archdeacon of Ossory in 1429. His namesake and successor in Cashel was appointed by the Pope on May 10, 1452. It should have been stated that Archbishop Cantwell I. held a Synod at Limerick in 1433. Mr. Seymour states that Archbishop Cantwell II. 'held a Provincial Synod at Cashel' in 1453; but this event took place at Limerick, the canons of which—with an excellent English translation—are given in Father Begley's *Diocese of Limerick*.

The oft-quoted story is told, as given by Blessed Edmond Campion, S.J., of the earl of Kildare and Archbishop Creagh in 1495. No doubt the subtle wit of the jest tickled King Henry VII. as the Earl confessed 'that he would not have burned Cashel Cathedral only that he thought the Archbishop was inside.' Anyhow the earl was made Lord Deputy of Ireland on August 6, 1496. Archbishop Creagh sided with Perkin Warbeck—though the fact is not mentioned by Mr. Seymour—but was pardoned in 1497. He died on September 5, 1503, and was succeeded by Maurice FitzJohn FitzGerald.

There is a difference of opinion as to the date of the death of Archbishop FitzGerald, but March 25, 1524, seems correct. Lynch probably misread the date, as he gives 1527. One thing is certain, that Edmund Butler, Prior of Athassel and Archdeacon of Ossory, was appointed by the Pope to the vacant see on October 21, 1524, and received the pallium a few months later.

In regard to Archbishop Butler, the last pre-Reformation Archbishop of Cashel, Mr. Seymour writes unreservedly as follows: 'It seems clear that he acknowledged the king's supremacy, *accepted the Reformed Religion*, and retained his archbishopric until removed by a Higher Power.' This

statement as it stands is misleading and untrue. The Archbishop, like many other prelates, acknowledged the king's supremacy in temporals, but he certainly never acknowledged Henry as Head of the Church, and he did not accept the 'Reformed Religion.' Of his orthodoxy there is no doubt whatever. Bishop MacCarthy, in his edition of O'Renehan's *Collections of Irish Church History*, thus vindicates Archbishop Butler :—

It has been inferred from this praise of Cowley (February 25, 1548), a decided advocate of the reformed religion, that the Archbishop himself was also favourably disposed to the new system. But *the inference is not warranted by anything stated in this letter, which seems to refer exclusively to a social, not a religious, change* ; as in it the Archbishop boasts of having done the best he could for the quiet of the country, in which sundry robberies and offences have been committed, and which therefore stands much in need of reformation.

It must not be forgotten that Archbishop Butler presided at a Synod at Limerick in 1529, and that he held the Archdeaconry of Ossory from 1516 to 1534 with the approval of the Holy See. Mr. Seymour gleefully quotes the letter of the Council, dated February 8, 1539, in which it is stated that the Munster Bishops all took the oath of supremacy, but any student of the State Papers knows what value to attach to this letter from such creatures as Brown, Allen, Brabazon, and Aylmer to their master, Lord Thomas Cromwell. Internal evidence alone stamps this letter of February, 1539, as a barefaced lie—at least the portion referring to the submission of the Munster Bishops. Who were the 'two Archbishops and eight Bishops that came to Clonmel' to hear the lucubrations of Archbishop George Browne? It is very significant that the writer of the letter, John Alen, the King's Chancellor, does not give us the names of even one of the ten Bishops who are alleged to have assembled in Clonmel. And surely if Archbishop Butler had taken the oath, as stated by Alen, his name would be specifically given ; yet not a word of him in the letter quoted by Mr. Seymour. But it is equally signi-

ficant that in the selfsame letter allusion is made to a friend of the Archbishop's, Sir Gerald FitzJohn of the Decies, and this noble kinsman of the Desmonds is described as one 'who openly maintaineth the Bishop of Rome and his partakers, against the king's supremacy.' Again, Nicholas Comyn, Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, in whose diocese Clonmel is situated, was certainly orthodox all through life. Similarly, John Quin, Bishop of Limerick, was perfectly orthodox, and ruled his see in communion with Rome from 1522 to 1551. And it is certain that Thomas O'Hurley, Bishop of Emly, did not take the oath; he was appointed to Emly in 1507, and ruled till his death in 1542.

Much capital is sought to be made out of the presentments of a Clonmel jury in 1537, as chronicled in the *History of Clonmel* by 'Father Bourke'; but even Mr. Seymour is inclined to discredit the obloquy cast on the memory of the Archbishop in an otherwise able historical work. It is really worse than a blunder for any serious historian to quote as deserving of acceptance the presentments of a packed jury, and even the editors of the State Papers dismiss these documents in a footnote. The illustrious Edmund Burke truly wrote: 'I rather suspect that vices are feigned or exaggerated when profit is looked for. An enemy is a bad witness: a robber is a worse one.'

It is worthy of note that Walter Cowley, Solicitor-General and Surveyor of Confiscated Abbey Lands, writes to Sir Edward Bellingham, Lord Deputy of Ireland, on June 25, 1549, that Archbishop Butler, instead of being of any assistance in the attempt to 'abolish idolatry, papistry, the Mass, sacraments, and the like' in the province of Cashel, was staying for some time in Dublin, where he could do no good. It only remains to add that Archbishop Butler died at Kilkenny on March 5, 1551, and was succeeded by Roland FitzGerald (Baron).

Taken all round, Mr. Seymour's book is a well garnered collection of entries from official sources in relation to the pre-Reformation Archbishops of Cashel; but it utterly fails to give a life-like presentation of the actual condition

of affairs, and it omits quite a number of important facts that serve to show the good work done by the various prelates who were Metropolitans of Munster in the period before the break with Rome. Cormac's Chapel alone would furnish an object-lesson in proof of the culture of pre-English times in Cashel, and of the high state of Hiberno-Romanesque architecture under the fostering care of Archbishop Donal O'Conaing, whose obit called forth such eulogies from the Irish annalists in 1137. And what a glorious episcopate was that of Archbishop O'Hayden from 1406 to 1440. He rebuilt the cathedral and the manor houses of the see, and erected a manse for the vicars-choral—eight in number—who were responsible for the singing of the canonical hours and the choral services in the cathedral, and whom he liberally endowed. Archbishop Cantwell further added to the endowments of the vicars-choral about the year 1475. The time is almost ripe for an adequate History of the Diocese of Cashel, and it is to be hoped that the enthusiasm evoked by the founding of the Catholic Record Society of Ireland will stimulate some priest of the diocese to undertake the task.

W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD.

AN IRISH HYMN TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN

THE following hymn to the Blessed Virgin was first printed by the late Professor Strachan in *Eriu*, volume i., page 122, without a translation. A literal version is given below :—

columcille *cecinit*.¹

I.

Δ Μυιρε μίν μαίτ-ινγεν
 ταραίρ ρυρταέτ ούν,
 Δ έριολ έυιρρ έομθετα,
 α έομραιρ να ρύν.

2.

Δ ρίξαν να ρίξμαιθε,
 α ναομ-ινγεν όξ,
 Δίτ ούν κο ρο-οίλξαιτε
 τριυτ αρ ταρμτέετ τρόξ.

3.

Δ έρόκυρτε, α οίλξεθαέ,
 κο ραέ ρρρηα[ι]τ ξλαιν,²
 ξυο υνο ιν ρί[ξ] ρίρ-υρεθαέ
 οον έλοινθ έυήρα έαιν.

4.

Δ έρθεθ οο έλοινθ ιερρε
 ιρμ³ έοιι-έαιιι έόμθ,
 Δίτ θαμ κον-ομ-βέ-ρε
 οίλξυο μο έυιτ έλόιν.

¹ A few aspiration marks and marks of length have been added. The metre is called in the old books *Cró cummaisc etiv casbairdne ocus leithvannagecht*, and consists of rhyming couplets, ending in a monosyllable, with seven syllables in the first verse of the couplet, which ends in a trisyllable, and five in the second.

² *ngloin*, MS.

³ *isin*=*asin*; *conombése* is Strachan's correction of *coniombisse*.

5.

Δ Μυρε, α μινο μορ-μαρεε,
 πο-τ-ραοραιρ αρ ριλ
 Δ Ιερμαιρε Ιορ-μαρεε,
 α Ιυβορτ να ριζ.

6.

Δ Ιιζαε, α Ιοινθερροα
 κο ηνηιμ ζενρα ζιλ,
 Δ αρζ ορι καιν κοινθεατα,
 α νοειμ-ζειν το νειμ.¹

7.

Δ μαδουρ να ριρυννε,
 πο-κινθιρ αρ εδε,
 Ζυρο Ιεμ-ρα το ρηιμ-ζεινε
 τομ ραοραο α μβραε.

8.

Δ βυαοαε, α βυνατα,
 α βυρνεε, α βαλε,
 Ζυρο Ιενο Χριρτ κυμαεταε,
 τ'αδουρ ιρ το μαε.

9.

Δ ρεετα ραν ροζυροε,
 α βιλε φο βιαε,
 Δ ρυορλλι τρεν τοζυροε,
 α ζριαν ζυροερ καε.²

10.

Δ αρραο να ηολλ-οιρθε
 τρερ-α-κινζ καε καιο,
 Ζυραο τυ αρ κομαρζε
 τοοεum ριζι³ ραιν.

¹ *neimh*, read *nimh*.

² *no goires cach*, Add. MS.

³ *rigi*, Strachan for MS. *rigtig*; perhaps *richid*, heaven.

II.

Δ εαταρ εαom cumpairde,
 τοο-ο-ραοζα in πί,
 Ολλαιζε βοί ac υπ-βρuiνθε
 τρεmπi co ba τπí.

I2.

Δ πίζ-τορμair ποζαιθε
 τμair-αρ-έin 1 cπí,
 Ξπien ταιcνεμάc τοζαιθε
 Ϊpu mac θεé bíi.

I3.

Δρ έζηαιpc na εαom-ζεine
 πο-compreo ic βρύ,
 Δρ έcηαιpc in εον-zene
 ιρ αιpο-πí¹ in εαc του,

I4.

Δρ έζηα[ι]pc Δ έpοicε-pium
 ιρ uaple ζαc epoié,
 Δρ έcηαιpc Δ εοναcαιl
 ετραναcετ 1 εloié,

I5.

Δρ έcηαιpc Δ epépzι
 αρραμαcετ πια εάc,
 Δρ έcηαιpc in ναοb-τεζλαιζ
 αρ ζαc του το² βpάc.

I6.

Ξοpοp τυ αρ comairci
 Δ πλαιc comθε cain,
 Conθεcram la ηlραζán,
 εime cén be[m] mair.

¹ *airdyig*, MS.

² *do* is a mistake for *co*.

TRANSLATION.

I.

O gentle Mary, good daughter,
Give help to us.
O cover of the divine body,
O shrine of mysteries.

2.

O queen of kings,
O chaste holy maid,
Pray for us that our sad sin
May be pardoned through thee.

3.

His mercy, His pardon,
With the grace of the Pure Spirit,
Ask with us of the just King
For the sweet good children.

4.

O branch of the race of Jesse
From the fair hazel wood,
Beseech for me that I may have
Pardon of my perverse sin.

5.

O Mary, O great fair jewel,
Thou hast saved our race,
O full beauteous candlestick,
O garden of kings.

6.

O bright-coloured one, O shining one,
With deed of white chastity,
O fair shining vessel of gold,
O holy child from heaven.

7.

O Mother of truth,
Thou excellest all,
Beseech with me thy first-born
To save me in judgment.

8.

O victorious one, O founder,
 O multitudinous, O strong one,
 Pray with us to Powerful Christ,
 The Father and thy Son.

9.

O noble chosen star,
 O flowery tree,
 O strong chosen torch,
 O sun whom all beseech.

10.

O ladder of the great inheritance
 On which every holy one walks,
 May you be our protection
 To the beautiful kingdom.

11.

O fair fragrant city
 The King chose thee,
 He was in thy pure womb
 Three times three months.

12.

O royal chosen door
 Through which the shining choice Sun
 Came into a body,
 Jesus Son of the Living God.

13.

Through the holy Child
 That was conceived in thy womb,
 Through the one Son
 Who is High-king in every place,

14.

Through His Cross
 Which is noblest of all crosses,
 Through His burial
 With which He was buried in a stone,

15.

Through His Resurrection
With which He rose before all,
Through the Holy Household
Out of every place to doom,

16.

Be thou our protection
In the kingdom of the good God,
That we may go with little Jesus
We pray whilst we live.

If all the poems that are wrongly ascribed to Columbcille in Irish manuscripts were put together they would fill a good-sized volume. Like the foregoing, many of them are very beautiful, and breathe forth the sentiments of the pious Gael in the purest language. I need hardly add that a prose version cannot be expected to do justice to such a composition.

PAUL WALSH.

THE ARIANS AND THE GREEK SCHISM

IT may very well be asked what connexion there could be between the schism of Cerularius in A.D. 1053 and a heresy which had completely disappeared from the East before the end of the fourth century. Nevertheless, I hope to show that the connexion was unfortunately but too real. By the Greek Church I here mean the whole Eastern Church as coextensive with the empire of Theodosius (A.D. 380).

The Greek Church of the ante-Nicene period (A.D. 325) has left a most glorious record. Its martyrs watered every city and town with their blood ; its heroic preachers, braving every danger, carried the Gospel even into the remotest hamlets, so that Pliny, Governor of Bithynia, had to inform Trajan that the temples of the gods were deserted. By this time the chief cities had their own bishops, priests, and deacons, as can be seen by the lives of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp.

The bishops of this period were, as a rule, select men who had not sought the dignity, but had been, on the contrary, often forced into it for their conspicuous merits. In those fervent times, when every true Christian had to carry his life in his hands, such men were by no means uncommon. We find in the life of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus that the Christians of Comana invited him to preside at the election of their bishop. At the first assembly they told him that with the other qualifications they wanted a bishop like himself, eloquent and well-born. But here their unanimity ceased ; name after name was proposed and rejected by the saint. At last some one cried out in derision, 'Let us elect Alexander, the coalporter.' 'Where is he?' said the saint. He was produced at once amid shouts of laughter, in his coarse and scanty garments, and all begrimed by the charcoal. Struck by his meekness under such provocation, the saint asked him a few questions and adjourned the assembly. On enquiry he found that Alexander was a man

in the prime of life, rich, handsome, and learned, and that he had come to this city to lead a hidden and laborious life, in order thus to preserve his baptismal innocence, and merit the reward promised by Christ to the meek and humble. At the next assembly the saint revealed his discovery : Alexander was then introduced in his new suit, and unanimously elected as Bishop of Comana. His name occurs in the Roman Martyrology on August 11 : ' Comanæ in Ponto S^{ci} Alexandri Episcopi, cognomento carbonarii . . . qui non solum predicatione, sed etiam per ignem consummato martyrio, fuit illustris.'

It is only from the same faithful record that we know the names of one hundred and forty of his episcopal brethren who laid down their lives for Christ during the same period ; and in this number we do not count the many confessors who, like St. Gregory himself, edified their flocks by their virtues, preaching, and miracles, and barely missed the crown of martyrdom. The number of priests and deacons on the martyrs' roll is, of course, much greater. With such bishops and such priests no wonder the Gospel spread with such amazing rapidity that Theodosius was able in A.D. 380 to close all the temples of the gods and prohibit every kind of pagan superstition. But we must not forget that all these priests lived under the strict law of clerical celibacy.¹

True zeal is diffusive, and hence the zeal of these holy men was not confined to the empire. Many a Greek missionary lost his life in the persecuting kingdom of Persia. Missionaries were also sent to the various tribes on the Northern frontier. St. Athanasius sent St. Frumentius into Ethiopia. Nor was the pagan West forgotten : Marseilles, Lyons, Vienne, and other cities in Gaul became Greek missionary centres for that entire country ; so that even at this day numerous churches in France honour Greek saints as their patrons and founders.

We get a last glimpse of the bishops of this period at the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325. Eusebius, an eye-witness,

¹ Thomassin, *Discipline de l'Eglise*, p. 1., l. 1., ch. xliii.

has to admit¹ 'that some were celebrated for their wisdom, others for their sufferings and the austerity of their lives, and others for their modesty.' We learn from St. Athanasius, another eye-witness, that some were celebrated for their gift of miracles, while others bore on their bodies the marks of their sufferings in the recent persecutions—some wanting a hand, others a foot, others an eye, while others bore the scars of the lash or of the red-hot iron. Theodoret² says: 'Several shone by their apostolic gifts, and many bore on their bodies the stigmas of Christ.' There were also among them several very learned men, like St. Eustachius of Antioch and Eusebius of Cæsarea. Of course all were not learned men, but there is no reliable evidence that any of them lacked the essential knowledge of their profession. There were among them no simoniacs, no hirelings, no court favourites; all had been elected under the strict rules inherited from apostolic times.

Never were the relations with Rome so cordial as during this period. Of the thirty Popes between St. Peter and St. Sylvester (A.D. 314), nearly a third were Greeks. St. Polycarp in his old age came from Smyrna to consult Pope Anicetus. Hegesippus, our earliest ecclesiastical historian, came from Jerusalem to see the same Pope. St. Irenæus went to Rome in A.D. 177 to see Pope Eleutherius. There was no dispute about Papal supremacy in those days. It was as natural to those Easterns as any other article of their faith. It was as clearly asserted by St. Irenæus in his work *Contra Hæreses* as by any writer since his time and as freely exercised by the Greek Popes as by the others. It was appealed to by not only the bishops but also by the Christian people in their greatest troubles. Thus the people of Corinth (A.D. 96), while St. John was still alive and not far from them, appeal to Pope Clement, who settles their disputes so authoritatively that Hegesippus, on his way to Rome sixty years later, found that Church in the most perfect peace. St. Dionysius of Corinth, writing to Pope Soter (A.D. 168-177), says: 'On this day we celebrated together the

¹ *Vito Const.* iii. 9.

² *Hist. Eccl.* i. 7.

Lord's holy day and read your letter, which we shall always read for our instruction, as we shall also read that previously written to us by Clement.' Eusebius¹ tells us that the epistle of St. Clement 'was publicly read in most of the churches down to his own time. Every persecuted bishop knew he had an appeal to Rome, as St. Dionysius of Alexandria (A.D. 260), St. Athanasius (A.D. 338), St. Paul of Constantinople, Marcellus of Ancyra, and many others about the same time.

To understand what follows we must keep in mind the organization of the Greek Church at this time, as described in the Council of Nicæa, and solemnly confirmed by its canons. All the bishops were immediately subject to their Metropolitans, and all the Metropolitans to five great Primates, who were soon after called Patriarchs and Exarchs, namely, the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and the Exarchs of Ephesus, Cæsarea, and Heraclea. The Roman Patriarchate embraced all the West, and all the countries between the Adriatic and the confines of Thrace, of which Heraclea near Byzantium was the ecclesiastical capital. This organization is thought to be of apostolic origin, and was always approved and upheld by the Popes. In those days of slow and difficult communication the greatest degree of autonomy compatible with unity was absolutely necessary for distant churches. Even so late as the seventh century Pope Honorius had to grant to the two English Archbishops the power to consecrate each other: 'Ne sit necesse pro ordinando Archiepiscopo ad Romam usque fatigari per tam prolixa terrarum et maris spatia.'

THE ARIAN PERIOD, A.D. 328-378

The small Arian faction showed no signs of life for some time after the Council of Nicæa. But on the return of Eusebius to Nicomedia, in A.D. 328, his restless and intriguing mind engaged at once in devising means to repair their fortunes. His first step was to secure the confidence of the emperor, and this he did by the most unbounded flattery

¹ *Hist Eccl.* iii. 16-38.

and the most hypocritical professions of orthodoxy. He gave him the most exaggerated notions of the imperial authority in religious affairs, and even persuaded him that he was the 'external bishop' responsible for the faith and morals of both clergy and people. Having succeeded thus far he assembled a few of the old leaders, men like himself, whose names and characters are given in Newman's *Arians of the Fourth Century*.¹ They had no idea of forming a new sect: their ambition looked much higher. They resolved by all possible means to impose their heresy on the Catholic Church. For this purpose they formed the most daring conspiracy ever known in the Church. They resolved to depose all the chief Catholic bishops and put Arians in their place. But how was this to be done? The emperor was certainly secured, but he would act only on the decree of a legitimate council, as he had done in the case of the Donatists and the Arians. Nothing could be expected from the canonical tribunals of the Church—the provincial, exarchal, and patriarchal synods. How was this difficulty to be got over? Eusebius had his mind made up on this point too. 'The emperor was still a catechumen and knew very little about such matters; he would take his (Eusebius') word for the legitimacy of any synod that might be held; we can always collect a number of our friends to form a synod.'

With this simple machinery they set to work in A.D. 331. St. Eustachius of Antioch was, after St. Athanasius, the greatest and most learned of their adversaries. In a synod held in his own city they accuse him of a most infamous crime; bribery and perjury do the rest. The saint is deposed; the sentence is presented to Constantine, who banishes not only the great and holy bishop, but a number of his clergy who had dared to protest against the new tribunal. An Arian was at once intruded into the see, and that vast patriarchate left at the mercy of the faction.

They next turned their attention to St. Athanasius, and by means exactly similar had him deposed and banished.

¹ Seventh edition, 1890.

They then disposed of the Exarchs, and finally of all the principal Metropolitans, so that at the death of Constantine in A.D. 337 the whole Eastern Church was in the power of the Arians. And yet he was not an Arian, nor did he know that Eusebius was one ; on the contrary, he thought him to be a good and holy man, zealous for the faith and morals of his episcopal brethren. He was baptized by him on his death-bed, and would not have knowingly allowed himself to be baptized by an Arian.

Constantius, a fanatical Arian, reigned for the next twenty-four years (A.D. 337-361), and carried on an incessant persecution against the Catholics. He was a ferocious man, even in all his civil relations. Here is a specimen of his dealings with the Church : The Arians gave him notice of their intention to substitute a man named Gregory of Cappadocia for St. Athanasius. To prepare for this event Constantius appointed a terrible character, named Philagrius, governor of Egypt. He published at once the imperial edict appointing Gregory to the see. The people in consternation fled from the heretic to the churches ; but Gregory pursued them at the head of a select body of soldiers, consisting of pagans, Jews, and desperate characters, who perpetrated on that day such profanations, cruelties, and murders as were seldom equalled even during the pagan persecutions. The new patriarch (!) made a triumphant progress through Egypt with exactly similar results. George, another of the patriarchs (!) imposed by this emperor, was if possible more savage and illiterate than his predecessor Gregory.

Eusebius, by court favour and contrary to the canons, had himself transferred from Berytus to Nicomedia, and now, in A.D. 340, he wants to follow the court to Constantinople ; to this there is only one obstacle : St. Paul, a man universally esteemed, is bishop of the see. But the packed synod and the emperor's edict of banishment make short work of this obstacle, and we behold Eusebius at last arrived at the summit of his ambition, the most powerful bishop of the Greek Church. He died about two years later, but in those two years he established principles which were

never forgotten by his successors. He was *de facto* 'bishop of bishops' over all the East; he claimed and enjoyed this enormous power as bishop of the capital of the empire; and his successors broached the general doctrine that ecclesiastical jurisdiction ought to follow the civil jurisdiction of the city in which the bishop resides.

Next came Julian (A.D. 361-363) and Jovian (A.D. 363, 364); they did nothing for the Arians, still their propaganda went on briskly. They had long since introduced a wholesale system of simony and had candidates ready for every vacancy, even in the smaller sees.

Then came a fanatical Arian, Valens (A.D. 364-378). A few instances will show his zeal in the cause. Towards the close of his reign Constantius had other troubles beside the religious question, and taking advantage of the occasion the Catholics of Cæsarea were able to recover that great see from the Arians. St. Basil's two predecessors were Catholics, his immediate predecessor having been elected in A.D. 362 during the short respite under Julian. St. Basil was elected in A.D. 370 by only a majority of one—the elder Gregory Nazianzen, who, in his ninetieth year, had himself brought in a litter from his sick bed. The Arians were so enraged at this election that they induced Valens to make that celebrated personal attack on St. Basil which ended so ignominiously for himself and his Arian friends. We must remember that these emperors had, under Arian advice, long since assumed the power to make and unmake bishops without the formality of even a packed synod.

Here is another instance: Finding himself about the year A.D. 369 at Tomi, the capital of a Scythian tribe on the Northern frontier, he asked their bishop, Vetrician, to adopt the Arian creed; the bishop stoutly refused, and was immediately banished.

While he was at Nicomedia, in the year A.D. 370, the Arians at Constantinople rose against the Catholics, many of whom were assaulted, wounded, and murdered. They sent a deputation of eighty ecclesiastics to implore the emperor's protection; he listened calmly, but gave private orders to his prefect, Modestus, one of the most ferocious

characters of those times, to have them all arrested and put to death. Under some false pretext they were induced to go on board a ship, which was sent to sea with orders to the sailors to set it on fire, save themselves in the small boat, and leave the passengers to their fate. They perished off the coast of Bithynia.

When we remember that this monster reigned fourteen years we can easily imagine the condition of the Greek Church at his death. But we need not tax our imagination; we have the sad facts in two letters written by St. Basil in A.D. 372.¹ The first was written to Pope Damasus. Having given numerous facts, he goes on thus:—

There is but one remedy for these evils, a visit from yourself. You consoled us often before in your great charity, and the report that you were to visit us now raised our hopes for a time. But having lost this hope and not knowing what to do, we have resolved to ask you to send us deputies filled with your own sentiments, capable of reconciling those who are at variance, of establishing union in the churches, or at least of ascertaining who those are that merit your communion. We have still at Cæsarea the epistle with which Dionysius [A.D. 259-269] one of your predecessors, consoled us; but the state of our affairs is far more deplorable at present. . . . If you do not come to our assistance at once, you will soon find no one to assist; everything shall be brought under the power of the heretics.

Encouraged by the Pope's reply, he wrote the following letter to the bishops of the West, signed by himself and about thirty of his principal colleagues, many of whom, like St. Meletius of Antioch, were still in exile. After a few introductory sentences he goes on thus:—

We conjure you to give free scope to your feelings and your zeal. Do not plead your occupations or the length of the journey or any other excuse: it is not a single church that is in danger, nor is it only two or three churches that are exposed to this furious tempest; the plague of heresy has extended its ravages from the confines of Illyria to the Thebaid. . . . The dogmas of

¹ Quoted by Rohrbacher, vol. vii.

piety and the laws of the Church are abolished. Ambitious men, devoid of the fear of God, invade the prelatures. The first place is the reward of the most notorious impiety. The man who utters the most horrid blasphemies is thought fit to be the bishop of the people. Sacerdotal gravity has perished. There is no one to feed wisely the flock of the Lord. Ambitious men consume the patrimony of the poor. No one observes the canons. Great is the liberty of sinners, to whom everything is permitted by those promoted through their influence. There is no justice in the tribunals, no laws for the people, no limit to the corruption, no authority in the rulers, who are the mere slaves of those to whom they owe their positions. Even the defence of orthodoxy is often made a pretext for private vengeance. . . With all this we endure the mockery of unbelievers, men of little faith begin to waver, the faith itself is uncertain, ignorance is widespread, the lips of the pious are closed, the tongue of the blasphemer is jubilant, holy things are profaned, the orthodox populations shun the houses of prayer as schools of impiety, and with tears and lamentations raise their hands in desert places to Him who dwells in heaven.

What lamentations, what fountains of tears, could be adequate to these evils? Hasten, dearest brethren, to our assistance while there still remains some vestige of former times, and before the churches suffer complete shipwreck. Have pity on us and do not allow half the world to be absorbed by error; do not allow the faith to be extinguished in the very places where it had first shone forth. What is needed is the presence here of a number of brethren sufficient to present the plenitude of a council which, by its numbers and the majesty of those whom they represent, may be able to restore the Nicene faith, stamp out heresy, recommend peace to the churches, and unite those who have the same sentiments. For the most deplorable thing of all is that those who seem to be still sound are divided amongst themselves. We seem to be threatened with calamities like those which befel Jerusalem during the siege of Vespasian: while pressed from the enemy without they consumed themselves by seditions within. In our case, beside the open war of the heretics, there is another between those who seem to be orthodox, which has reduced the churches to the utmost weakness. It is for this, and chiefly for this, we need your assistance, in order that those who profess the apostolic faith may put an end to their divisions and submit henceforth to the authority of the

Church ;¹ so that the mystic body of Christ being restored in all its members may be perfect, and we may be no longer reduced as at present to praise the happiness of others, but that our own churches may resume once more their former orthodoxy. How can we sufficiently admire the blessing vouchsafed to you by the Lord, which enables you to distinguish between the true and the false, the pure gold and the dross ; and to preach the faith of the Fathers without dissimulation or reticence ? This faith we have received, this faith we recognize by its apostolic character, in this faith we acquiesce, as well as in all that has been canonically and legitimately decided in your synodical letter.²

St. Basil was at this time Metropolitan of Cappadocia and Exarch of Pontus, which included this and nine other provinces ; his means of observation were therefore very extensive. In the above letters he mixes up the internal and external dangers of the Church, but in other letters³ he gives us a glimpse at the internal abuses. We must recollect that in the confusion and uncertainty of the times clerical training had become well nigh impossible. Hence, at every vacancy the electors had to accept almost anyone who offered himself with the sole qualification of orthodoxy. The result was a new race of bishops altogether inferior to the old, both intellectually and socially, to say nothing of the complete absence of the sacerdotal virtues and acquirements. It was such men as these that voted against St. Basil, for they wanted neither a reformer nor a disciplinarian. During the nine years of his episcopacy he received more opposition than co-operation from them. He had to reprove their apathy, avarice, and tepidity ; for want of the slightest spark of zeal they indolently allowed vacant sees to fall into the hands of the Arians. He obliged an aged parish priest, named Paregorius, to dismiss his young housekeeper, not that he suspected anything wrong, but on account of the bad example. He also put down the wholesale simony

¹ He alludes here chiefly to the schism of Antioch, which arose from the exile of St. Eustachius, already noticed.

² This allusion is to the Decrees of a Roman Council which he had received with the letter of Pope Damasus.

³ Quoted by Rohrbacher, vol. vii.

which he discovered amongst the chorepiscopi. We saw his reference to the prevalent ignorance ; well, an ignorant bishop, named Anthimus of Tyana, gave him immense trouble. Valens divided Cappadocia into two provinces, with Tyana as capital of one. Anthimus having heard of the new doctrine broached at Constantinople, claimed the right to be Metropolitan of the new province, but St. Basil resisted with all his might, and at the General Council of A.D. 381 we find Cappadocia still a single ecclesiastical province. All this created for him numerous enemies, and the Arians were on the watch for a pretext to bring him before one of their packed synods, knowing that they could rely on the connivance of some among his own brethren. They had not long to wait. The bishops of one province broke off from him, on the plea that he had communicated with a bishop named Eustachius suspected of heresy. The clergy of another place accused him of being the friend of monks, and of having introduced new devotions. To all these he answered that he was ready to stand his trial before a legitimate synod, and there the matter ended. All this gives us an idea of the internal condition of this remote exarchate, but we must recollect that it was just the part of the empire which had suffered least from Arian violences, and that at Constantinople and the other great cities the Catholics had not a single church at their disposal.

Valens died in A.D. 378, and Gratian at once published an edict of toleration, recalled the exiled bishops, and ordered the churches to be restored to those who communicated with Pope Damasus. St. Basil died on January 1, A.D. 379, and on January 19 Theodosius the Great became Emperor of the East. He confirmed the decree of Gratian, and restored the churches at once to their rightful owners. The Arian leaders migrated to the tents of the barbarians on the frontier, whose nascent Catholic faith they easily corrupted by appealing to their hatred of the empire. Hitherto they had posed as true Catholics in spite of all the anathemas of Popes and councils, but now they organized an avowedly Arian Church, which these fierce tribes carried with them soon after into Italy, Gaul, Spain, and Africa.

Arianism as a creed had struck no roots in the East, and disappeared almost at once when deprived of State support. But it left behind a number of far-reaching abuses which gradually prepared the Greek Church for the final schism.

THE NEW ABUSES

The Arians for their own ends had made the emperors supreme in the domain of religion. They had planted in the see of Constantinople the seeds of unbounded ambition. They had superseded the old tribunals by packed synods. For the free and conscientious episcopal elections they had substituted court influence, simony, and violence. They had abolished the law of clerical celibacy. They had abolished the *Disciplina Arcani*, and discussed the most sacred subjects in the markets, wine-shops, baths, and theatres. They had abolished the public penances.

These abuses were still recent and could be easily reformed with the aid of a Hildebrand to rally the bishops, and an emperor who had not to be sent to Canossa. Hildebrand is on the spot in the person of St. Gregory Nazianzen; the emperor is there just baptized at Thessalonica by St. Ascholius, Vicar of Pope Damasus; and the bishops are already summoned for the General Council of A.D. 381. Never has such an opportunity been vouchsafed to any other Church. A bare statement of the rights of the Church would be enough to induce Theodosius to annul the pretended rights bestowed on the Arian emperors. The ambition of the Bishops of Constantinople could be nipped in the bud by simply republishing the sixth canon of Nicæa. The packed synods might have been extinguished by insisting on the observance of the canons of the same Council. The same may be said of the episcopal elections. Even the law of clerical celibacy could have been protected by a canon, at least where it was still observed: Egypt, Syria, Achaia, Thessaly, Macedonia.¹ St. Epiphanius, Metropolitan of Cyprus (A.D. 367-403),² tells us that the law

¹ Döllinger, *History of the Church*, vol. ii. (English translation).

² Quoted by Thomassin, *Discipline de l'Eglise*, p. 1., l. i., ch. xliii.

was still in force but sadly violated owing to the negligence of some bishops.

The Council met in A.D. 381, and was so orthodox in its doctrinal decisions that it acquired the rank of a General Council by the conformation of the Popes and the Church. It enacted only four canons of discipline,¹ and only one of these condemns any of the above abuses, namely, the second canon, which condemns indirectly the packed synods. But it did something more: it confirmed the very worst of these abuses by this short canon: 'The Bishop of Constantinople ought to have the pre-eminence of honour after the Bishop of Rome, for this city is the new Rome.' It thus disturbed the ancient order by which the Bishop of Alexandria held the second place and the Bishop of Antioch the third. This mischievous canon, though condemned repeatedly by the Popes, brought untold evils to the Greek Church.

This was the last chance of restoring the Greek Church to its ancient discipline and fervour; how was it thrown away? The Council included a large number of venerable men like St. Meletius of Antioch, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Ascholius of Thessalonica, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Peter of Sebaste, St. Pelagius of Laodicea, St. Eulogius of Edessa, and many others; how is it that they were unable to make their influence felt in the Council? Alas! the majority were men of a very different stamp—young men who had been hastily elected to fill the vacant sees.²

During the Council a most providential opportunity presented itself for ending the greatest scandal in the East, the schism of Antioch. St. Gregory entreated them not to miss the opportunity, but all in vain; out of pure jealousy of the Latins they actually ensured the prolongation of the schism. This is the first public manifestation of the anti-

¹ Hefele, vol. ii.

² Rohrbacher, vol. vii., gives St. Gregory's description of them: 'Mercaturam faciens ex fide hic fuit scriba vectigalis; hic reliquit aratrum, ligonem, gladium, vel ramum; talis fuit iudex vel profectus militaris; multi exiis artifices fuerunt.'

Latin spirit, and it is only right to take a note of its authors. Not content with this insult to their venerable president, they began to question the legitimacy of his election; to cut the matter short he stood up and resigned the see. They elected in his place Nectarius, a catechumen whose moral reputation was not above suspicion. It is quite clear that there were men amongst them who wanted no reformer: we shall see proofs of this later on. Far from troubling himself about the existing abuses, Nectarius availed himself of the first opportunity to confirm one of them by abolishing the office of Penitentiary. By letting the abuses alone, he had a quiet reign of sixteen years, just long enough to give these abuses some sort of prescription.

His successor, St. John Chrysostom (A.D. 398), was a man of a very different stamp. He set at once about reforming both clergy and people. He made strict rules for the protection of clerical continence, and even touched the burning question of clerical celibacy by showing his preference of celibates for confidential positions. In a synod at Ephesus he deposed six simoniacal bishops. He also deposed Gerontius of Nicomedia. His history shows how one of the cherished abuses worked. An unworthy deacon of Milan, he had fled to Constantinople, gained admittance to court as a physician, and was soon rewarded by the great see of Nicomedia. St. Ambrose had written to Nectarius about him.

All this reforming zeal gradually increased the number of the saint's enemies. The packed Synod of the Oak deposed him in A.D. 403, and the Emperor Arcadius banished him to the most remote corner of the empire, where he died in A.D. 407, after such a course of inhuman treatment as seldom falls to the lot of even the greatest criminals. This lesson proved to all men that the Greek Church was no place for reformers. Hence, we never again hear of any serious episcopal reformer.¹ There were plenty of reforming canons which were never observed, as far as the most fundamental abuses were concerned.

¹ This is all the more remarkable from the fact that there were often some great and holy bishops among them, and even several canonized saints.

There are several landmarks by which we can note the progress of spiritual decay within the Greek Church. We know already from St. Basil the point at which it had arrived in his time. But even then the old hatred of schism and heresy was so strong that ten years later there was scarcely a trace of Arianism in the land. But the Arians had left behind that irreverent mania for disputation already noticed, and this mania produced heresy after heresy in quick succession. By the end of the fifth century fully one-half the population, both clergy and people, had become Nestorians and Eutychians.

In the year A.D. 484 Pope Felix III. had to excommunicate Acasius, Bishop of Constantinople, and yet the people adhered to him until his death in A.D. 489. The schism continued for nearly thirty years longer, but on the death of their idol the people had begun to reflect, the old spirit gradually revived, and at the accession of the Catholic Emperor Justin, in A.D. 518, there was a popular demonstration unique in the history of the Church.¹ In the cathedral on the very first Sunday, the people cried out to the patriarch, whom they knew to be Catholic at heart :—

Why are we still excommunicated? Why are we so many years without Communion? We desire to receive Communion from your hand. For many years we have been wishing for Communion. You are orthodox; what have you to fear? Publish at once the holy council. Saint Mary is Mother of God. . . . Send the synodal letters to Rome. . . . Produce the dyptics; insert the name of Leo, Bishop of Rome.

This scene lasted several hours, and was repeated next day: it shows what an immense reserve of popular faith still existed. But, alas! there were no true pastors to cultivate it. Döllinger tells us² that, through fear of the emperor, five hundred bishops had joined by their signatures in this schism, 'so great was the degeneracy of the Oriental Church at this period.' However, the great popular demonstration was not in vain; letters from the patriarch and

¹ Rohrbacher, vol. viii.

² *History of the Church*, vol. ii.

the emperor were sent at once to Rome, and after some time the celebrated formulary of Pope Hormisdas was signed by all the bishops of the East.

As the *Henoticon* of Zeno (A.D. 482) had a chief share in this schism, we may here notice the unlimited authority exercised by these emperors. Not only did they make and unmake bishops and convoke synods *motu proprio*, but they framed and imposed creeds under the severest penalties; the *Henoticon* was one of these. The *Ecthesis* of Heraclius (A.D. 639) was another, as also the *Typus* of Constant (A.D. 648) and the impious creed of Constantine Copronymus in A.D. 754. All this began with the Arians, who changed their creed several times, and got their emperors to impose each in turn. The Popes never appealed to these illegitimate powers exercised by the emperors. The bishops received the *Ecthesis* with the most servile adulation, and the people with sullen indifference. The *Typus* was imposed under penalties far more severe, and by a more terrible master. The bishops tamely submitted and left all the opposition to the monks, one of whom, St. Maximus, was the most celebrated theologian of the time. To make him subscribe to the *Typus* he was imprisoned, scourged, banished, and at last barbarously murdered. But there was one bishop whose signature the tyrant valued more than all the rest, Pope Martin. He sent troops to Rome to coerce him; he was brought prisoner to Constantinople, treated with the greatest barbarity, and banished at last to Cherson, where he died a martyr.

We have another landmark in the Council of 338 bishops held by Constantine Copronymus in A.D. 754. Of these Döllinger says:¹

This assembly revealed the deep degradation into which the Byzantine Church had fallen. Only a few of the bishops were really opposed to sacred images, but the great majority bowed in servile compliance to the will of the court. . . . The emperor then received an oath from them to look upon all images as idols, and to hate and persecute monks wherever they might find them.

¹ *History of the Church*, vol. iii.

Under the Emperor Constantine VI. an end was put to the schism by the seventh General Council, which was held at Nice in A.D. 787. The schism was renewed under Leo the Armenian in A.D. 813, and ended again in A.D. 842 under the Empress Theodora and a council of bishops, 'who,' says Döllinger, 'knew no other law than the will of the court.'¹

Our next landmark is the schism of Photius (A.D. 858). Whether on account of his notorious ambition, the infamy of his patrons, his barbarous treatment of St. Ignatius, or some remaining love of unity, the schism was unpopular with all parties outside the detested court faction. That the people sincerely wished for unity seems clear enough; but this cannot be said for the bishops, who one day defended St. Ignatius and abandoned him for bribes and promises the next. The emperor boasted that he had over three hundred bishops in the synod that condemned the saint. Photius was banished in A.D. 867 by the Emperor Basil, and at the request of the Pope the eighth General Council met in A.D. 869. At the death of St. Ignatius in A.D. 878 there was a reaction in favour of Photius, 'so deeply corrupted,' says Döllinger again, 'and in general so degraded were the Byzantine clergy.'

Our final landmark is the schism of Cerularius in A.D. 1053. He was an ignorant and ambitious fanatic without the learning or ability of Photius, and yet, in spite of the emperor, his schism was enthusiastically welcomed. Such was the progress of ignorance under married priests during these two centuries that the flimsy reasons which were laughed at in the time of Photius were thought good enough for the Greeks of the eleventh century. It is worthy of remark that both appealed to the fears of the married clergy. Photius called the law of celibacy a 'Manichean heresy.'² It is also worthy of remark that the clergy of

¹ Hefele, in his account of the seventh General Council, tells us that it was there publicly asserted by the monks and not denied that a majority of the Greek bishops at this time had purchased their positions.

² Cerularius had heard of the vigorous efforts of St. Leo IX. and Cardinal Hildebrand at this very time to enforce the law of clerical celibacy in the West; and alludes to it in one of his mad public documents against the Latins as one of their unpardonable crimes. This was a good appeal to his married clergy.

the second order are hardly ever mentioned in the past numerous changes and revolutions. They accepted every change and gave no trouble; they had their wives and families to mind. How different from the priests of the ante-Nicene period, and even from the celibates of the Arian period, who shared all the troubles of their flocks. The Council in Trullo (A.D. 692) abolished the law of clerical celibacy, and published a canon against simony; yet in A.D. 1054 the emperor had to make a law to reduce the tariff for ordinations and for induction to parishes! ¹

The reader can now easily trace the present Greek schism to its true sources. The abuses inherited from the Arians continued in full activity during all these centuries. Ignorance and corruption were constantly on the increase. No Hildebrand, no Thomas à Becket, no Peter Damien, no Charles Borromeo ever appeared among the bishops; no Curé of Ars among the priests. The wonder is, not that the schism came at last, but that it had not come some centuries earlier. In justice to the sorely-tried people we should never forget that it took seven centuries of most execrable government in Church and State to wean them from the faith of their ancestors, and to persuade them that unity was not essential, that schism was no sin, and that they could be good and true Christians though separated from Rome.

The relations of the Popes with the Greek Church during all these centuries form a most interesting and instructive part of this long story, but we have only room to say that the Papal supremacy was appealed to by all parties, and was not explicitly denied even by Cerularius.

All the abuses that made the schism possible are still at work to perpetuate it; even the ecclesiastical despotism of the Emperors has been inherited by the Sultan and the Tsar.

SENANUS.

¹ Rohrbacher, vol. xiv. p. 23.

CATHOLIC MARRIAGE LAWS AND THE DECREE 'NE TEMERE'

SO much clamour has been raised in recent times about the Decree *Ne Temere* and the Catholic Church legislation regarding marriage that we have thought it may prove useful just now to explain in a few plain words, stripped of technicalities, in what that legislation consists in so far as it applies to the particular point that has caused all the disturbance.

In order to understand the modification introduced by Pope Pius X. it will be necessary to say a word about the regulations that were in force in Ireland before the Decree *Ne Temere* was issued. And as a preliminary even to this it will be well to recall the fact that the Catholic Church has at all times regarded the marriage of Christians contracted in due form as a sacrament. She bases her belief in that doctrine on Scripture, on the constant tradition of the Church from the earliest ages, on the testimony of the Fathers, and on the clear and explicit teaching of the Church in the East as well as in the West for many centuries before the Council of Trent had assembled. All that will be found clearly set forth in any dogmatic treatise on the Sacraments, and as clearly established. There have been objections raised to it; but they have been answered and refuted wherever they have been met. We cannot enter into the discussion of the question here. It is beside our purpose; but we wish to say before going any further that the Catholic Church and Catholic theologians do not base their argument from Scripture to prove that marriage is a sacrament on the translation of the Greek word *μυστήριον* into the Latin *sacramentum*, in the text of St. Paul to the Ephesians (vv. 31, 32). The Protestant Bishop of Down and Connor in a recent inflammatory speech said that this was the only argument from Scripture on which Catholics relied to prove that marriage was a sacrament. Not only is it not the only

proof, but it is an expression on which Catholics do not rely at all. No competent theologian of the Catholic Church relies on the translation of *μυστήριον* into *sacramentum*. Even a candidate for Orders who would do so would run great risks of failing at his examination. As a matter of fact it is mentioned in our schools only to be rejected. And yet a bishop of a Church that boasts of its learning does not hesitate to indulge in such a misrepresentation. It is a sad commentary on the value of education; and we are not surprised at the rather severe rebuke for this and other errors and misstatements of fact which the *Church Times*, an organ of the Protestant Church in England, administers to him:—

It is with feelings of peculiar shame [it says] that we read the outpourings of the Right Rev. Prelate. . . . We are filled with shame, we say, in hearing of this rubbish poured from the lips of a Bishop of our communion into the greedy ears of Belfast groundlings. So speaks the worst kind of demagogue, pandering to the fiercest prejudice, stirring the most odious passions, and doing all in the name of our civil and religious liberties. Poor Ireland!

The Catholic Church, at all events, whatever Dr. Crozier may say, has always regarded marriage validly contracted between Christians as a sacrament; and, moreover, she holds that the contract is the sacrament and that there is no real distinction between one and the other. Her right and duty to watch over and guard the sacramental contract are, of course, unquestionable. This is exactly what she did at the Council of Trent.

THE TRIDENTINE DECREE

Such strange, loose, and erroneous doctrines were preached in those days in regard to marriage that the Church felt bound to remind the world solemnly that matrimony was one of the seven sacraments; and to cut off her own children, as she was thoroughly justified in doing, from the novelties in regard to marriage that were coming into vogue she issued amongst other regulations at the Council of Trent the famous Decree *Tametsi*, which

declared clandestine marriages amongst her subjects to be null and void ; and required that all marriages of members of the Church in order to be valid should be solemnly contracted in the presence of the parish priest (or his deputy) of one of the contracting parties and two or three witnesses. This Decree was only to come into force, however, in places where it was promulgated. Speaking generally, Protestants were not regarded as bound by this law, nor were clandestine mixed marriages annulled by it in those places where the Decree was not promulgated. The object of the Council and of the Popes, who saw to the application of its Decree, was in the main to safeguard the moral and religious interests of Catholics. The Church was not anxious to press her legislation on those who did not acknowledge her authority. Hence various concessions were made in the matter of clandestinity by her executive authority to countries where the population was of a mixed religious character.

These concessions clearly show the peaceful character and disposition of the Church and her reluctance to cause any disturbance in the social affairs of States or communities, even where the vast majority of the people are hostile to her religious claims. Now in one place and now in another exemptions from the law of clandestinity in regard to mixed marriages were granted when sought for in a peaceful and respectful way by the competent authorities, whether civil or ecclesiastical. This took place in Germany, in Hungary, in Canada, and various other countries. In some places the Holy See declared that the general law did not apply. In some places it had fallen into abeyance. In others special exemptions from it were granted. In a famous letter to Napoleon Bonaparte Pope Pius VII. stated that he could not declare null the marriage which had been contracted by the Emperor's brother, Jerome, with Miss Patterson of Baltimore ; because the Decree of the Council of Trent did not bind in the case of mixed marriages where Protestants were the vast majority of the people, even though it had been promulgated in the Catholic churches of certain localities in these countries.

In Ireland it was only when the Penal Laws were relaxed and Catholics began to be tolerated that the Decree of the Council of Trent was generally promulgated. Even then it was not proclaimed simultaneously all over the country. It had been in force in the greater part of the province of Armagh since the days of Queen Elizabeth. It was only in the year 1827 it was promulgated in the province of Dublin. In 1795, however, Pope Pius VI. declared, through a Rescript of Propaganda, that clandestine mixed marriages contracted or to be contracted in those parts of Ireland where the Decree of Trent had been promulgated should be regarded as valid, provided there was no other canonical impediment. And in the year 1887 the Holy Office, in a reply to the Archbishop of Dublin, made a similar declaration in regard to those parts of the country where the Tridentine Decree had been promulgated subsequently to the Rescript of Pius VI. Thus up to the time when the Decree *Ne Temere* was issued clandestine mixed marriages that were not invalid on other grounds were regarded as valid in Ireland, although, of course, they were illicit.

THE DECREE 'NE TEMERE'

In the Decree *Ne Temere* issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Council, and confirmed by Pope Pius X. on August 2, 1907, various modifications were made in certain disciplinary regulations regarding the betrothals and marriages of Catholics. The law regarding domicile and quasi-domicile in a parish, which caused so much difficulty and anxiety to the clergy and the contracting parties, was made clear and concise. It was not easy to know who was the proper parish priest in certain circumstances, and it was essential that this should be made clear in order that marriages might not run the risk of invalidity and be deprived of the graces which flow from the sacrament. It was then decreed that only those marriages should be regarded as valid which should be celebrated before the parish priest or the bishop of the place (or the delegate of either of them), with at least two witnesses. The Decree then sets forth in the clearest terms who the authorized parish priest is, when

he assists licitly and when he assists validly, and in what exceptional cases his presence is not needed for validity. The whole regulation was a great boon to Catholics, both clerical and lay. It was expressly declared that this law had nothing to do with those who were not Catholics. But as in mixed marriages the Catholic party is subject to the laws of the Church it was not thought right that he or she should benefit by disobedience to the laws of their own communion or by acting in opposition to the spirit of them. For everybody knows that mixed marriages are forbidden by the Church and were hitherto regarded as illicit unless a dispensation from the Church impediment was obtained. They were, therefore, provisionally at least, held bound by the general law. The words of the Decree are :—

The same laws are binding also on all Catholics, as described above, if they contract betrothal or marriage with non-Catholics, baptized or unbaptized, even after a dispensation has been obtained from the impediment of mixed religion or disparity of worship, unless it should be otherwise decreed by the Holy See for some particular place or region.

Here the final clause, '*nisi pro aliquo particulari loco aut regione aliter a Sancta Sede statutum sit,*' shows that no tyrannical or unbending spirit pervades the Decree. On the contrary, as in former days, if a fair case is made out for exemption we have no doubt it may be granted. It will be granted, however, if at all, to responsible and representative persons, but is not likely to be obtained by threats, insults, and misrepresentation. The outcry, so far as it has gone, seems to us to be manufactured largely for political purposes by political bishops and other skilful agitators. There is, of course, not the smallest doubt that the Catholic Church is opposed to mixed marriages. Not only is she opposed to them in theory, but she had hitherto in practice placed every obstacle in their way short of declaring them invalid. She had gone so far as to devise a special impediment, though not an invalidating one, to make them more difficult. Yet even now she will still hold them as valid

if they are celebrated in the presence of her pastors or their delegate; and should the Catholic party so far forget what is due to the faith of his fathers as to go to a heretical place of worship to contract this solemn bond, and forsake his own altar and his own Church, so great is the veneration of the Catholic Church for the contract in itself, that the Holy Father puts in a special proviso which still holds out hope of recognition even to those who act towards her a part so unworthy of her sons. For the time being we do not see any very urgent need for such exemption from the law in this country. So far only one case of anything like hardship has been mentioned; and whether that case is fairly represented or not we have not the slightest knowledge. We have heard only one side of the case, and that from a quarter that does not inspire us with much confidence in its impartiality. The whole legislation of a Church or of a State cannot be set aside for one doubtful case of hardship.

The experience of mixed marriages in this country is not such as to encourage the ecclesiastical authorities to seek for a mitigation of the law. Protestants know quite well that the Church can only give a reluctant consent to mixed marriages on account of the danger involved to the faith of the Catholic party and its offspring, if there should be any, and requires before she grants a dispensation for such a marriage a solemn promise on the part of the non-Catholic party not to interfere with the religious belief of the other and to bring up any children there may be in the Catholic faith. Frequently we have seen these promises made; frequently they have been honourably and nobly kept; but frequently also we have seen them flagrantly violated. The faith of her children is more precious to the Catholic Church than crowns and kingdoms; and no fair-minded Protestant can complain if she takes all possible precautions to save it from destruction or from danger. But whilst she dislikes mixed marriages, and sets her face against them, she does yield to some extent to the frailties of human nature, and grants exemptions. This, however, she does, under the present

law in regard to clandestine mixed marriages, not by way of dispensation, for the purpose of screwing money out of Catholics, as the Orangemen so handsomely suggest, but by way of special arrangements for particular countries.

In the case of Germany a new code of marriage regulations had just been devised by the Holy See, after conference and consultation with bishops, statesmen, and diplomatists of the German Empire, a year or so before the Decree *Ne Temere* was issued. Much confusion had hitherto existed owing to different modes of procedure in different parts of the Fatherland arising from various historical causes. In the Constitution *Provida* these were unified, simplified, and made coextensive with the Empire. They recognized the validity of mixed marriages, whether clandestine or not, and, subject to some slight limitations, were allowed to stand after the Decree *Ne Temere* was promulgated. This provision of the German code was subsequently extended to Hungary, after similar representations had been made. Should any serious necessity arise for it we have no doubt that it will be extended to other countries as well. But cause must be shown, and it cannot be expected that the Church will readily confer privileges on subjects who disobey her laws which she denies to those who observe them. If it can be shown that the new law inflicts any serious grievance on Protestants in this country we are satisfied that due consideration will be given to any representations that may be made on that head. Such has always been the policy and practice of the Church in this matter. There is really no need for all the clamour, the speeches, and the demonstrations. At the present juncture we fear that their object is an entirely different one. If it be what it professes to be the storm is altogether unnecessary, and calculated, we should say, to defeat its purpose. The Church will reason with reasonable people, but not with unreasoning enemies.

J. F. HOGAN, D.D.

Notes and Queries

THEOLOGY

THE MORAL PRINCIPLES OF THE 'TABLET'

IN the *Tablet* of January 21st a leading article, unsigned, appears on 'Railway Fares and Conscience.' The *Tablet* holds that 'not transferable' imposes no obligation in justice on those who do not consent to the condition when they purchase their tickets. In proof of this it says that because 'the travelling public do not give consent to that condition when they purchase their tickets, it is thereby proved that that condition is not a term of the contract.' I have already¹ replied that the travelling public who buy their tickets without a word of dissent, and who do not intend to be bound by the condition, enter into a fictitious contract, and are, in consequence, guilty of fraud.

The *Tablet* says that 'there is no fraud in entering into a contract in the same way and in the same sense in which it is commonly entered into by conscientious and even scrupulous people.' Does the *Tablet* seriously maintain that, no matter how clearly the seller of an article might insist on a condition which he is within his right in imposing, his customers are not bound to abide by it so long as many conscientious and even scrupulous people think that the condition is not binding? If a sufficient number of the conscientious public be kept in ignorance of their contractual obligations, you are free to do as they do! Surely such theology deserves serious condemnation. The practice of these good people would be useful as a means of interpretation if it were not clear that the railway company can and does insist on the condition as a term of the contract; but when the authority and the intention of the company

¹ Cf. I. E. RECORD, December, 1910, p. 632.

are made perfectly clear, no argument against its rights can be based on error, however widespread.

There are conscientious people who think that they are justified in transferring and accepting tickets that are 'not transferable,' but usually they do not base their theory on the principles of the *Tablet*. They either believe that they can presume on the consent of the company, or think that the condition is not reasonable. Of course, exceptional cases arise when individuals, in this as in other matters, can reasonably presume on consent, but these cases must be examined on their own merits. They cannot be solved by a general rule which supposes that the company has no right to insist effectively on the observance of so reasonable a condition as that under consideration.

The *Tablet* acknowledges that 'if an apt case of law could be quoted, the legal decision might throw light on the moral question.' Such a case can be and has been quoted by me. For the benefit of the editor of the *Tablet* I shall again quote the words of the learned judge (Cockburn) who decided the case in the High Court of England :—

It is not a case of a single ticket taken by A, but which A, being unable to use it, hands over to B, a case which possibly might admit of different considerations. The ticket was a return ticket which the company issues at a cheaper rate, because they find it advantageous to issue tickets to persons intending to return at a cheaper rate. If it is given by the original taker to a person who seeks to use it for a single journey, and so to travel at the cheaper rate for such a journey, it seems to me clear that such person does travel without having previously paid his fare with intent to avoid payment thereof.¹

If a similar decision were obtained by an ordinary trader against a client, would it not be deemed presumption on the part of a theologian to tell the client that he had paid the just price of the article which he had bought? But it would seem as if some people regard railway companies as outside the pale of the ordinary rules of justice.

¹ Cf. I. E. RECORD, December, 1910, p. 633.

Calling attention to the article, the editor of the *Tablet* says that it is 'an authoritative and reasoned decision.' We have seen what the reasoning of the article is like. As for the 'authoritative' nature of the 'decision,' we have yet to learn that the Holy See has commissioned the *Tablet* to give authoritative decisions on questions of faith or morals. Till such a decision emanates from the proper tribunal we are compelled by the principles of justice to regard the opinion of the *Tablet* as false and liable to sully the reputation for honest dealing which the Catholics of these realms enjoy. It is most regrettable that a responsible Catholic journal should act as sponsor of transactions which the High Court of England has declared to be fraudulent.

J. M. HARTY.

LITURGY

MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS IN CHURCH

REV. DEAR SIR,—The superior of a monastery sometimes authorizes one of his priests (Father B.) to give Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament after last Mass on Sundays in the secular church attached to the monastic church. The music on these occasions is rendered on thirteen fiddles by the little boys from the local poor school, though the organ is in the church. Will you kindly say in the I. E. RECORD :—

(1) If the fiddle is included in the instruments forbidden by the Pope in his *Motu proprio* on Sacred Music, which says: 'The employment of the piano is forbidden in church, as is also that of noisy or frivolous instruments such as drums, cymbals, bells, and the like.'

(2) Should the superior, before allowing the use of the fiddle in Benediction service, have the express permission of the Bishop of the diocese to do so?

Thanking you in anticipation.—Yours sincerely,

SACERDOS.

Paragraph 15 of the Papal Instruction on Sacred Music thus runs :—

Although the music proper to the Church is purely vocal

music, music with the accompaniment of the organ is also permitted. In some special cases, within due limits and within the proper regards, other instruments may be allowed, but never without the special licence of the Ordinary, according to prescriptions of the *Ceremoniale Episcoporum*.

A subsequent paragraph (19) reads: 'The employment of the piano is forbidden in Church, as is also that of noisy or frivolous instruments, such as drum, cymbals, bell, and the like.'¹ Again, there was a question asked of the Congregation of Rites in November, 1908, about the employment of *clarinets* and *oboes*, and the reply was that these instruments might be tolerated, '*dummodo moderate, et obtenta pro quovis opere ab Ordinario licentia, adhibeantur.*' From the official pronouncements it will not be difficult to give an answer to the above questions. In the first place, the violins should not be introduced unless the permission of the Ordinary is previously and explicitly obtained. It will not be enough to presume on this consent. In the next place, it may be said that the violin is not among the instruments condemned in paragraph 19 of the Papal instruction. Common estimation would not classify it among either the 'noisy' or the 'frivolous.' Moreover, its general character and wide popularity have long secured it an honoured place among instruments and endowed it with an aptitude to give appropriate expression and rendering to every form of musical composition. But since an instrument that has in itself the capability of giving forth sweet sounds and soft, melodious strains may become, by unskilful manipulation or intemperate use, a source of discord and distraction, so care should be taken to have the violins kept under proper control and played with a moderation that will be no hindrance to devotion. Within these limitations, and with the permission of the Ordinary, the use of the violin may be sanctioned at Benediction.

¹ Cf. I. E. RECORD, February, 1904.

 LESSONS OF FIRST NOCTURN IN OFFICES OF IRISH PATRON SAINTS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly say in a coming issue of the I. E. RECORD what is the rule for the Lessons of the Offices of the Irish Patron Saints (such as St. Otteran) that are of Double Major rite. Are the Lessons to be taken from the Scripture occurring or from the Scripture of the Common? There has been a good deal of discussion on the matter among some clerical friends, and an early answer will oblige.—Yours truly,

SACERDOS JUNIOR.

As a general rule in Festive Offices^r of Nine Lessons those of the first Nocturn are taken from the Scripture assigned to the particular day of the year on which the Feast occurs. The arrangement of the 'Scripture occurring' was first established by Gregory VII. in the Decree *Sancta Romana*.^s It has been substantially observed ever since only that, at present, owing to the multiplication of Festive Offices and the shortening of the Scriptural Lessons, we do not succeed in reading all the books of the Old Testament within the year in accordance with the original purpose. By this arrangement, too, were allocated to each season, or portion of the year, those parts of the Scripture which may be supposed to be specially appropriate to it. Thus to Advent are assigned portions of the Book of Isaias, because this prophet spoke with a peculiarly striking foresight about the nativity of the Redeemer, while to Passiontide are appointed the writings of Jeremias, who describes beforehand, with graphic pen, all the minute details of the sufferings of the Saviour.

It has been said that the Lessons of the first Nocturn are as a rule to be taken from the 'Scripture occurring.' This rule, however, has exceptions, as will be seen from the Rubrics of the Roman Breviary, tit. xxvi. The first class of exceptions embraces those Offices, of whatever rite they may be, that have proper Responsories for the first Nocturn. In this case the Lessons are taken from the Scripture of the Common. Secondly, the Feasts of certain Doctors of the Church and of a few Confessors have special Lessons for the

first Nocturn, as is usually indicated in the Breviary. Thirdly, Offices that are celebrated with a special solemnity—such as Doubles of the first and second class—have their Lessons from the Common if they do not happen to be specially assigned. As to Offices of Double Major rite—the class to which the query refers—for a long time they were treated in the same way as those just mentioned, but in 1896 the Congregation of Rites modified the existing regulation. In this year the Congregation was asked whether in view of the increasing number of those high-class Offices it would not be more expedient to have the Lessons in Double Majors taken from the Scripture occurring instead of from the Scripture of the Common. The following reply was given:—

*Praesentibus rerum adjunctis inspectis, Lectiones I Nocturni proprias vel de Communi Sanctorum esse in posterum adhibendas tantum pro Duplicibus I vel II cl. : illis tamen Lectionibus exceptis, quae approbatae jam fuerint, vel in Breviario habentur pro duplicibus majoribus seu etiam minoribus : vel aliis, quas pro specialibus rationibus vel adjunctis Sacra Rituum Congregatio approbare deinceps censuerit.*¹

The Decree is not retrospective in its effect—that is to say, it does not affect those Offices of Double Major, or even of simple Double rite, that have had already Lessons specially approved for the first Nocturn. Neither shall it apply to those that may be privileged in this respect in the future. To answer the question proposed, therefore, it only remains to ascertain whether in regard to the Offices of the Irish Patron Saints, that are of Double Major rite special Lessons were approved for these in the past. The great majority of these Offices were only of simple Double rite up to the year 1883. In this year, at the request of the Irish Bishops, they were raised to the rank of Double Major, in order that they might not be displaced in occurrence with other Feasts. It will also be remembered that in the year 1903 the Holy See approved the specially written Lessons for the second Nocturns. In neither document, however, is there any indication that these were specially

¹ June 30.

assigned Lessons for the first Nocturn. But there is some evidence in support of this to be deduced from the Roman Breviary, published in 1904, with the approval of His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, and also from the recent editions of Continental Breviaries. In the Irish supplement to the former there is a direction in the case of Offices of Double Major rite that all is to be taken from the Common, while in regard to Offices of merely Double rite the Lessons of the first Nocturn are ordered to be taken from the Scripture occurring. It is to be assumed, then, that the compiler of Gill's Breviary had authority for directing that the Lessons of the first Nocturn in Offices of Double Major rite were to be taken from the Scripture of the Common. This same direction is also given in the recent editions of Breviaries published on the Continent. Hence it would appear that there is a special sanction of the Holy See for taking the Lessons of the first Nocturn of the Offices of the Irish Patron Saints from the Scripture of the Common and that, in consequence, they do not come under the recent Decree of the Congregation of Rites dated June 30, 1896.¹

PATRICK MORRISROE.

¹ N. 3923.

DOCUMENTS

RULES OF THE INSTITUTE OF THE OBLATES OF THE
IMMACULATE VIRGINCONFIRMATIO INNOVATIONUM QUAE EX DECRETO REGULARIUM
CONGREGATIONIS INDUCTAE SUNT IN REGULAS INSTITUTI
OBLATORUM VIRGINIS IMMACULATAE

PIUS PP. X.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Decessorum Nostrorum vestigiis insistentes, ad religiosorum virorum congregationes ex quibus Ecclesia Dei tot tantaque emolumenta nanciscitur, singulari paternae Nostrae voluntatis studio oculos convertimus, vigili cura prospicientes, ut eadem illis omnibus praesidiis muniantur, quae ad ipsarum utilitatem, bonum atque incrementum magis accommodata atque opportuna Nobis videantur. Frugiferas has inter Congregationes iure meritoque accensenda est, quae a ‘Missionariis Oblatis Mariae Immaculatae’ nomen habet, et ad Aquas Sextias in Provincia iam inde ab anno MDCCCXVI fundata, per Apostolicas Litteras eadem hac forma die XXI Martii mensis, anno MDCCCXXVI datas, a Leone PP. XII. rec. me. Praedecessore Nostro tum Instituti, tum Regularum adprobationem obtinuit. Haec enim Congregatio, quae sibi quasi titulum pro certamine bono certando assumpsit Divini Magistri verba: ‘Evangelizare pauperibus misit me’ nullo unquam tempore destitit in agri Dominici messem multos eosque sedulos cultores mittere, qui, strenue laborantes, laeti tandem cum exultatione portarent manipulos suos. Brevi in universum terrarum Orbem, Deo favente, diffusa, novem in praesens ipsa Congregatio provinciis pollet. Quatuordecim Apostolici Vicariatus et in America Septentrionali, et in Africa Meridionali, et in Asia, manent Oblatorum Missionariorum a Virgine Immaculata curis concrediti: ipsa tam vasto terrarum marisque intervallo dissita Australia, plura ab hac Congregatione accepta referre debet beneficia. Immanis itaque campus huius Congregationis Missionariis patet, quasi aperta apostolicis laboribus exantlandis palestra. Meritis laudum praeconiis Congregationem eandem prosequuti sunt Romani Pontifices, qui iteratis vicibus per Litteras piscatorio annulo obsignatas, Institutum ipsum, Apostolica interposita auctoritate, roborarunt.

Ita regulas ipsius Instituti confirmavit Gregorius PP. XVI. per Litteras die XX Martii mensis, anno MDCCCXLVI datas, et nonnullas Constitutionum et regularum earundem immutationes atque additiones ab ipsius Congregationis Capitulo Generali statutas, Pius PP. IX. per similes Litteras die XXVIII Martii mensis, anno MDCCCLI datas, solemniter sanxit. Iamvero novissimis his annis opportunum visum est Congregationi Episcoporum et Regularium negotiis diiudicandis praepositae, decernere atque indicere, ut constitutiones Congregationis superenunciatae Missionariorum Oblatorum Immaculatae Conceptionis ita immutarentur, ut vigentis iuris conditioni conformes evaderent; dictoque audiens ipsius Instituti generale Capitulum ad hoc coadunatum, tales intulit memoratis constitutionibus innovationes, ut illas quasi nova forma donaverit. Variationes vero sic in Constitutiones inductas, utpote quae temporum circumstantiis et recentioribus Decretis Apostolicae Sedis apprime responderent, nova Congregatio disciplinae Regularium praeposita, ad quam transmissae fuerant, per decretum die XXI Decembris mensis, anno superiore editum, approbavit. Nunc autem Venerabilis Frater Augustinus Dontewill, Archiepiscopus titularis Ptolemeidensis, supremus Moderator memoratae Congregationis Oblatorum Mariae Immaculatae, humili prece Nos flagitat, ut supra enarratam regularum instituti sui innovationem, per Apostolicas Litteras in forma Brevis confirmare dignemur; Nosque animo repetentes historicas Congregationis ipsius memorias, quae saeculi spatio, ex quo originem duxit, amplissima cumulavit merita et in universo terrarum Orbe spirituales fructus uberrimos nacta est, his quidem optatis annuendum libentissime existimavimus. Quae cum ita sint, variationes quae, uti supra diximus, in constitutiones ad usum eiusdem Congregationis Oblatorum inductae sunt, iam ab hac S. Sede approbatas, prouti liquet ex decreto quod recensuimus, ab hodierna Congregatione Religiosorum disciplinae praeposita, die XXI Decembris mensis, anno superiore, edito, Motu proprio atque ex certa scientia et matura deliberatione Nostris, nunc iterum probamus, supremoque Auctoritatis Apostolicae munimine roboramus et confirmamus, ratasque eas in omnibus, praesentium tenore, habemus atque edicimus. Decernentes praesentes litteras firmas, validas et efficaces semper existere et fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri et obtinere, illisque ad quos spectat, vel spectare poterit, in omnibus et per omnia plenissime suffragari: sicque in praemissis per quoscumque Iudices ordinarios et delegatos

iudicari et definiri debere, irritumque esse atque inane, si secus super his a quoquam, quavis auctoritate, scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari. Non obstantibus Constitutionibus et Ordinationibus Apostolicis, ceterisque omnibus speciali licet atque individua mentione ac derogatione dignis in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die VII Septembris MDCCCX, Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *a Secretis Status*.

L. ✠ S.

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS X. TO THE ARCH-
BISHOP OF BOGOTA

EPISTOLAE

AD R. P. D. BERNARDUM HERRERA RESTREPO, BOGOTENSIIUM
ARCHIEPISCOPUM, ANNOS XXV EPISCOPATUS EXPLENTEM

Venerabilis Frater, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.—
Nuncium vixdum allatum Nobis est subeuntis episcopatus tui natalis quinti ac vigesimi, vota quidem pro incolumitate tua absentes fecisse haud satis habuimus: opportunum duximus hisce etiam litteris tibi adesse laetanti. Hanc pietatis significationem tua a Nobis exposcit pastolaris navitas. Nescii enim haud sumus te hoc potissimum nomine vulgo laudari quod, nullam officii sanctissimi partem missam faciens, multum contendas dioecesis clerum, sive in sacris seminariis in Ecclesiae spem adolescat, sive, sacerdotio auctus, vineam, Domini excolendam sit aggressus, ita sancte instituere ut quicumque eidem iungitur, verbis utimur Sancti Gregorii, aeternae vitae sapore condiaur. Optimum sane consilium, idemque, hoc maxime tempore, quum effrenatis licentia moribus christiana disciplina in quotidianum vocatur discrimen, dignum plane quod a Sacrorum Antistitibus pari discrimini contentione urgeatur. Magna enim vis exempli, et vix ullum suppetit medium ad homines Christo lucrificandos aptius quam sancta clericorum consuetudo. Ea quippe brevi et efficaci itinere quisquis edocetur quid christiana postulet professio, et ad idem persequendum animus facilius permovetur. Tene igitur quem coepisti cursum: perspicias qui eiusdem futurus sit exitus, quum probe scias virtutes concreditarum ovium fore gaudia aeterna pastorum.

Ne vero ad fructuosos labores, actatis flexu, te animi deficiant

vires, Apostolicam Benedictionem, coelestium auspicem bonorum, tibi, Venerabilis Frater, et omnibus qui tuae parent sacrae potestati, peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum, die x Octobris anno MCMX, Pontificatus Nostri octavo.

PIUS PP. X.

THE VALIDITY OF INDULGENCES

S. CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

(SECTIO DE INDULGENTIIS)

DUBIA CIRCA INTERPRETATIONEM MOTUS PROPRII 'CUM PER APOSTOLICAS' DIEI 7 APRILIS 1910

Feria IV, die 15 Iunii 1910

Exortis circa interpretationem Motus Proprii 'Cum per Apostolicas' diei 7 Aprilis anni currentis quibusdam dubiis, Supremae huic Sacrae Congregationi S. Officii sequentia quaesita proposita, sunt, videlicet:

1°. Utrum S. Congregationi S. Officii recognoscendae exhiberi debeant concessiones Indulgentiarum et facultatem Indulgentias respicientium quae ante diem 1 Novembris 1908 a S. Congregatione tunc temporis Indulgentiis praeposita et a Secretariis Brevium et Memorialium obtentae fuerunt?

2°. An dictae exhibitioni sint obnoxiae concessiones Indulgentiarum facultatumque Indulgentias respicientium quae a Brevium Secretaria obtentae sunt post diem 1 Novembris 1908; quaeque sive ante sive post eandem diem 1 Novembris 1908 a quovis alio, praeter recensita, S. Sedis Officio seu Dicasterio prodierunt?

3°. An Indulgentiae ac facultates Indulgentias respicientes ante diem 1 Novembris 1908 aliter quam per tramitem alicuius ex supra laudatis S. Sedis Officiis seu Dicasteriis obtentae, debeant et ipsae S. Congregationi S. Officii exhiberi ab eaque recognosci sub poena nullitatis?

4°. Utrum S. Congregationi S. Officii recognoscendae, ut supra, exhiberi debeant facultates, quae conceduntur ex peculiari Apostolico privilegio ab Ordinibus Religiosis, tamquam ipsorum propriae, benedicendi pias imagines, coronas, scapularia, numismata et similia (utpote a Minoribus pro Crucifixis ad Viam Crucis, a Praedicatoribus pro coronis Rosarii, a Carmelitis

pro scapularibus B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo, etc.) eisque Indulgentias adnectendi ?

Quibus mature perpensis, Eñi ac Rñi DD. Cardinales Inquisitores Generales in plenario conventu habito feria IV die 15 curr. mensis Iunii respondendum decreverunt :

Ad 1^{um}. Negative.

Ad 2^{um}. Affirmative ad utramque partem.

Ad 3^{um}. Affirmative.

Ad 4^{um}. Negative.

Sequenti vero feria V die 16 eiusdem mensis SSñus D. N. Pius divina providentia PP. X. in solita audientia R. P. D. Adessori S. Officii impertita, Eñorum Patrum resolutiones adprobare et confirmare dignatus est atque insimul declarare 'non fuisse suae intentionis comprehendere sub N. 1^o Motus Proprii "*Cum per Apostolicas*" facultatem Benedictionem Apostolicam cum Indulgentia Plenaria una alterave vice vel determinato alicui personarum coetui impertiendi.'

Romae, ex Aedibus S. Officii, die 17 Iunii 1910.

ALOISIUS GIAMBENE, *Substitutus pro Indulgentiis.*

L. ✠ S.

THE PIOUS SOCIETY OF PRIESTLY REPARATION

CONSTITUITUR SUPREMUS MODERATOR

PRO ASSOCIATIONE REPARATIONIS SACERDOTALIS

PIUS PP. X.

Dilecte fili, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.—Piam frugiferamque Associationem, quae e sacerdotibus praecipue constans, nomen atque institutum *Sacerdotalis Reparationis* habet, peculiari benevolentiae Nostrae significatione etiam nuper prosecuti sumus, caelestibus eam thesauris libentes locupletando. Vehementer enim probavimus finem sibi ab ipsa propositum, utpote quae religionis caritatisque operibus iniurias in tanta temporum acerbitate Deo ab iis, qui minus debeant, illatas resarcire studeat ; et grato accepimus animo nonnullos eius sodales, se etiam piaculares victimas exhibendo, reparationem pro illorum peccatis offerre ; sociosque universos omni ope adniti, ut qui e tanta vitae dignitate in culpam inciderint, ad muneris decus omnino revocentur. Quare cum tu, dilecte fili, a Nobis suppliciter petieris ut huiusmodi Consociationem novis privilegiis augere dignaremur, Nos piis hisce votis propensa voluntate censuimus

obsecundandum. Praesentium igitur tenore Apostolica auctoritate Nostra Superiorem Generalem Congregationis Missionis pro tempore existentem, praedictae Associationis Reparationis Sacerdotalis Supremum Moderatorem perpetuo facimus et constituimus, eique omnia et singula tribuimus iura et praerogativas, quae huius officii sunt propria. Praeterea opportunum esse ducimus, ut quaelibet alia Consociatio, tum erecta tum in posterum ubique terrarum erigenda, cuius sodales ad eundem finem Sacerdotalis Reparationis animos intendant, memoratae principi Associationi, quo communes et exoptati fructus satius percipiantur, adnectatur. In contrarium non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die II Maii MCMX, Pontificatus Nostri anno septimo.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *a Secretis Status*.

L. ✠ S,

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS X. TO THE ARCH-BISHOP OF PARMA

AD R. P. D. GUIDONEM M. CONFORTI, PARMENSIUM ARCHIEPISCOPUM, OB PIETATIS OBSEQUIUM BEATISSIMO PATRI BINIS LITTERIS EXHIBITUM

Venerabilis Frater, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.—Binas nuper a te epistolas accepimus: alteram dabant qui e tuo clero Sacerdotes, laudabili more, secesserant ad renovandos ad sanctitatem animos, quique pietatis significationem uberiores voluere addita petriana stipe: dabant alteram diligentiores ex eodem sacro ordine viri, qui, te advocante, convenerant consilia initari ad rem catholicam penes fideles istos acrius, ut ratio temporis exposcit, provehendam, muniendam firmius. Utraque porro periucunda Nobis accidit, qui in utraque et propensae in Nos voluntatis et optimae navitatis haud dubium perspeximus argumentum. Id quidem libet merita exornare commendatione et prosequi gratia. Unius et alterius te, Venerabilis Frater, auctorem esse cupimus iis nomine Nostro nunciandae qui praefatas subscribere epistolas, quos insuper participes esse volumus Apostolicae Benedictionis quam tibi, Venerabilis Frater, reliquo tuae dioecesis Clero populoque universo peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum die XIII Octobris MDMX, Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

PIUS PP. X.

THE TEMPORAL ADMINISTRATION OF CLERICIS—DECREE OF
SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE CONSISTORY

S. CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS

DECRETUM

DE VETITA CLERICIS TEMPORALI ADMINISTRATIONE

Docente Apostolo Paulo, *nemo militans Deo implicat se negotiis saecularibus* (2 Tim. ii. 4), constans Ecclesiae disciplina et sacra lex haec semper est habita, ne clerici profana negotia gerenda susciperent, nisi in quibusdam peculiaribus et extraordinariis adiunctis et ex legitima venia. 'Cum enim a saeculi rebus in altiorem sublatis locum conspiciantur,' ut habet SS. Tridentinum Concilium *Sess. XXII, cap. I de ref.*, oportet ut diligentissime servant inter alia quae 'de saecularibus negotiis fugiendis copiose et salubriter sancita fuerunt.'

Cum vero nostris diebus quamplurima, Deo favente, in Christiana republica instituta sint opera in temporale fidelium auxilium, in primisque arcae nummariae, mensae argentariae, rurales, parsimoniales, haec quidem opera magnopere probanda sunt clero, ab eoque fovenda; non ita tamen ut ipsum a suae conditionis ac dignitatis officiis abducant, terrenis negotiationibus implicant, sollicitudinibus, studiis, periculis quae his rebus semper inhaerent obnoxium faciant.

Quapropter SS^{ms} Dominus Noster Pius PP. X., dum hortatur quidem praecipitque ut clerus in hisce institutis condendis, tuendis augendisque operam et consilium impendat, praesenti decreto prohibet omnino ne sacri ordinis viri, sive saeculares sive regulares, munia illa exercenda suscipiant retineantve suscepta, quae administrationis curas, obligationes, in se recepta pericula secumferant, qualia sunt officia praesidis, moderatoris, a secretis, arcarii, horumque similium. Statuit itaque ac decernit SS^{ms} Dominus Noster, ut clerici omnes quicumque in praesens his in muneribus versantur, infra quatuor menses ab hoc edito decreto, nuntium illis mittant, utque in posterum nemo e clero quodvis id genus munus suscipere atque exercere queat, nisi ante ab Apostolica Sede peculiarem ad id licentiam sit consequutus. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuslibet.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus sacrae Congregationis Consistorialis, die 18 mensis Novembris anno MDCCCX.

L. ✠ S.

C. CARD. DE LAI, *Secretarius.*
S. TECCHI, *Adessor.*

NOTICES OF BOOKS

THE LIFE OF BLESSED JOHN EUDES. By Father M. Russell,
S.J. London: Burns & Oates.

FATHER RUSSELL has done a really great service by writing in a concise and engaging form the life of the Blessed John Eudes. It is a characteristic of this great saint that his work was as effective as it was unobtrusive; and this latter quality may, to some extent, explain why it is that the official recognition of his sanctity has taken place more than two hundred years after his death. He was born November 14, 1601. One of his brothers, Francis Eudes, is better known as 'Mézerai,' the well-known author of a History of France, and a member of the French Academy; and 'Mézerai' never wrote anything historically truer than his tribute to his brother's memory: 'I leave,' he says, 'two hundred pounds for a monument to my brother, Father Eudes, although indeed his virtue and his character have raised a more beautiful monument than the hands of men can raise to him.' Father Eudes received the rudiments of his education from a neighbouring parish priest, James Blanette. His further education was given in the Jesuit College at Caen, the town which was to be the scene of so much of his holy work. He joined the Fathers of the Oratory on Lady Day, March 25, 1623, and was ordained priest on December 20, 1625; and, as an act of privation, refrained from saying Mass till midnight of Christmas. As an Oratorian he devoted himself to the new work of the missions. In this work he must have gained a large experience throughout France, and there began to dawn upon him one of the two projects with which his name is most associated—the sanctification of ecclesiastical students by training in seminaries. In 1645 Father Eudes left the Oratorians, and decided to establish a new Order, whose work should be the training of priests for the secular mission. Father Russell thinks that his reason for leaving the Order was because of the spirit of Jansenism which had infected some of its most prominent members. But is it not better to assume that it was the positive call to a noble and peculiar work that determined him; and that had he been free from such a call, he would have manfully

remained in the Order he loved so well, and would have fought might and main to free it from undesirable elements? His second great project was the establishment of an Order of Nuns who should devote themselves to the rescuing and safeguarding of penitent Magdalens. Whilst still an Oratorian he had begun the work by placing some poor girls under the care of a good and humble soul, Magdalen Lamy. One day Blessed John Eudes and some friends were passing her door: 'Where are you going, all of you?' she cried out. 'No doubt to the church *pour y manger les images*. And then you will think yourselves very pious. *Mais ce n'est pas là que git le lièvre*. What you ought to do is to found a house for those poor girls who are going to ruin through poverty and neglect.' Suffice it to say that on November 25, 1641, the work of Our Lady of Refuge was begun at Caen. Owing to the foundation of the new observance of the Good Shepherd, under Mother Euphrasia Pelletier, in 1829, alongside of the primitive observance of Our Lady of Refuge, *la famille Eudistique* is now composed of four organizations: the Order of Our Lady of Charity of Refuge, and the Order of the Good Shepherd, the Eudist Fathers, and an association similar to the Third Order of St. Francis. There is no house of the Eudist Fathers in Ireland, but the two Orders of Nuns are established here—the Good Shepherd Nuns carrying on their pious work from their homes in Limerick, Cork, etc.; whilst Dublin is the scene of the saintly labours of the Nuns of the primitive observance of Our Lady of Charity of Refuge. One house is established outside the city, at High Park, Drumcondra, whilst the other, in Gloucester Street, is waging a holy war against sin and misery in the very heart of the city itself.

For other details as to the life and work of Blessed John Eudes, for an account of his writings and of his love for and establishment of the devotion to the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, we must refer the reader to Father Russell's excellent biography. The Blessed John Eudes died on August 19, 1680; and on Sunday, April 25, 1909, our Holy Father Pius X. declared him Beatified, to the overwhelming joy of his spiritual children, whose representatives came from every quarter of the world to be present at the solemn ceremonial of the Vatican.

P. M'S.

JACQUETTA. By Louise M. Stacpoole-Kenny. London: Washbourne, Ltd.

FEW would suppose, from the title of this book, that it is an attempt to depict Irish life. We cannot say that the attempt has resulted in even a moderate amount of success. One has doubts while reading it whether the characters are not a series of caricatures; yet the book is meant to be serious. The scene is laid chiefly in Kilrush, though we are also taken to London and Rome, with glimpses of India, Australia, and Canada thrown in. With the single exception of Dr. Desmond, the professional gentlemen of Kilrush are represented as a very curious set indeed. Mr. Davoren, R.M., an elderly gentleman 'with a bald head and a flowing white beard,' falls in love with Jacquetta at first sight! So does Mr. M'Carthy, D.I., a half-madman, who afterwards commits murder and suicide. So does Mr. O'Mulligan, a local attorney, 'a red-headed, ferret-eyed little fellow of atrocious manners.' Father M'Mahon, P.P., 'mops' his ruddy face with a red bandana—carried, presumably, in his hat. His conversation is neither elegant nor edifying. Here are samples: 'Yes, yes; let us go down to the parlour. I must pay my respects to the wife. Well, well; John, you rascal, to think of your having a wife and a kid,' etc. Again, at the convent, while Jacquetta is discussing her vocation with Father Gardyne, S.J.: 'Come in and eat, for, vocation or no vocation, men and women are born to eat, whatever else they may do.' Father Gardyne, we suppose, is meant as a contrast to the parish priest. He is 'worn and haggard,' with a 'fine ascetic face,' and an intolerable pain—somewhere. The story, too, is quite up to date. We have golf and motors; there is a touch of the sex problem, and the suffragettes are represented in the odious person of Bedelia O'Mulligan. Mrs. Desmond, on whom a good deal of attention is bestowed, smokes a cigar! Cigarettes, she was told, are bad for the heart and nerves. She tried a *pipe*, but pronounced it *bestly*.

It would seem as if the book were meant for the delectation of a certain class of readers outside Ireland. The hero—if he is the hero—expresses fine contempt for 'O'Brien, Dillon and Co.,' and 'the lot who are trying to ruin the country.' He contests a seat *in the South of Ireland*, and is returned in the Conservative interest by a majority of twenty-six. The peasantry are mentioned in the following novel terms: 'Himself could not pay the rint, bekase he took a dhrap too much and spint the

money he got for the pig in potheen.' But we do not think that even the most credulous reader will regard this story as a picture of any phase of Irish life. We have noticed it, perhaps, at too great length; but we wish to enter our protest against such travesties of Irish life and character.

T. O'D.

THE PLAIN GOLD RING. Lectures on Home. By Rev. Robert Kane, S.J. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1910.

In the midst of all its musical rhetoric there is a great deal of solid and useful instruction contained in this volume. It is dedicated by permission to the Infanta Paz, Princess Louis Ferdinand of Bavaria; and in a short preface the author explains that it is made up of lectures delivered in many places in England and Ireland. The lectures are six in number, and deal with marriage in its various aspects, and with the home which is the result of Christian marriage.

In the opening lecture Father Kane shows that Christian marriage is a sacrament. His demonstration is not strictly deductive and theological; but it is such a demonstration as one might expect to find in a sermon or popular lecture, and is good of its kind. There is, perhaps, no more interesting question in theology than the theological deduction from certain texts of Scripture, sayings of the Fathers, and practices of the early and medieval Church both in the East and West of the sacramental character of Christian marriage. Father Kane's development of his thesis is accompanied by those beautiful reflections and poetic appeals to the imagination and the heart with which we are now accustomed to associate his name. He can be at the same time intensely realistic. His pictures of the unhappy home and its causes are works of art. His description of the homeless is pathetic in the extreme. His lecture on 'The Cradle and the Grave' is solemn and awe-inspiring. The whole work is musical and eloquent; and although it does not reach the grandeur of *The Sermon on the Sea*, its various *motifs* are worked out with exquisite skill.

Many persons who could not be got to read a heavy treatise on home duties are sure to read this work, which they will find it a delight to read, and cannot but be the better for their trouble.

J. F. H.

EARLY STEPS IN THE FOLD. By F. M. de Zulueta, S.J.
London: Washbourne, Ltd.

As its title indicates this book is addressed to converts. Their difficulties both before and after entering the fold are treated in a masterly style by one who has evidently a wide experience. Six chapters are devoted to this portion of the work. The remaining chapters treat of the various duties and devotions of a Catholic. It is an excellent manual to put into the hands of the seeker after truth; while the ordinary priest on the mission, who may never be called upon to instruct converts, will find here, in convenient form, materials for very useful instructions. The book can be unreservedly recommended.

T. O'D.

AT HOME WITH GOD. Prie-dieu Papers on Spiritual Subjects. By the Rev. Matthew Russell, S.J. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1910.

THE title of Father Russell's book, to some extent, indicates its contents. We have papers on 'Good Desires,' on 'Uncharitable Talk,' on 'Pain,' on 'Humility,' on 'The Presence of God,' on 'The Presence of Man,' and so on; but whilst we are kept on our knees throughout 239 octavo pages, Father Russell seems to consider that it is not possible to give undivided attention to matters purely spiritual for so long a time, and hence places under us a little cushion stuffed with secular anecdote. We should not be ungrateful to him for it. His wide reading gives him a peculiar power of finding illustrations in unexpected quarters. He introduces us to St. Jerome, Father M'Swiney, S.J., St. Augustine, Carlyle, Cardinal Newman, Father Faber, Mr. James Bryce, St. Thomas Aquinas, Charles Stewart Parnell and Francis Thompson, Mr. Gladstone and Cardinal Manning, O'Connell and Cicero, Edmund Kean, the actor, and the Rev. Myles Gaffney, Dean of Maynooth College, William Cowper and Sir James Murray, the lexicographer, and, like the good Irishman that he is, Father Russell winds up with Sir William Hamilton and Judge O'Hagan. It is a motley assembly, but, somehow or other, Father Russell presses them all into his service. His topographical range extends from Rostrevor and Adare to Syria. Father Russell's work is one which is sure to elevate the reader and make him sensitive to things to which the world pays little heed. Quickened as we were by his own teaching in the third

paper, we should be glad to see removed from an otherwise admirable chapter the following sentence : ' But could we imagine Dean O'Brien of Limerick or Dr. Murray of Maynooth, or (here comes in the grotesque inequality) O'Connell himself, doing the work they did respectively, without the vanity which they all three, in different manners and degrees, undoubtedly betrayed ? ' Without admitting the truth of the above, we make answer that we could not only imagine it, but could imagine them doing their work much better without this alleged vanity. At any rate, in a work entitled *At Home with God* ' Nil nisi bonum ' is a good motto.

P. M'S.

LAUNCELOT ANDREWES AND THE REACTION. By Douglas MacLeane, M.A. With Illustrations. George Allen & Sons.

THIS is an interesting biography by one who regards his subject as a hero, one of the theological luminaries and fathers of the Anglican Church. Andrewes was Dean of Westminster in Elizabeth's time, and under James became successively Bishop of Chichester and of Winchester. He steered his course in the *via media* all his life, and managed to retain a considerable share of the ceremonies of Catholic Liturgy in private use, and of Catholic doctrine in his prayers and exhortations in those shifting times.

THE VIA VITAE OF ST. BENEDICT. By Dom Bernard Hayes, Monk of the English Benedictine Congregation ; with an Introduction by the Right Rev. Dr. Hedley, Bishop of Newport. London : Washbourne, Ltd.

THIS is a series of devout meditations on the Rule of St. Benedict which will be found useful and stimulating by many who do not wear the habit of the holy patriarch. As a model of the exercise of mental prayer the book can be highly recommended. It shows most efficiently by practical example how meditation can be easily and fruitfully made on the duties of the daily Christian life. The text of the Rule of St. Benedict is taken up piece by piece, translated into English, considered in its practical bearings : the suggestions of self-examination, the pious affections, resolutions, prayers, and ejaculations all flow

so naturally that meditation seems to be no longer the formidable exercise that most people find it. The Rule itself is most interesting reading, reflecting in every detail the reasonableness, kindness, and tolerant sympathy for human weakness of the great father of the monks, while it provides for all, from mitred abbot to the humblest brother, a clear, definite guide in the way of ascetic perfection. It is characteristic of the saint that the last chapter declares that the whole observance of perfection is not set down in the Rule, but that the Rule leads to the beginning of holiness.

FRANCIS DE SALES: A STUDY. By Louise M. Stacpoole-Kenny. London: Washbourne, Ltd.

FOR this fascinating biography we have nothing but praise. The life-story of St. Francis de Sales is full of courtly, romantic, and heroic interest, and it has lost nothing by the studiously simple recital of the present author. She is full of reverence for her subject, and has the gift of communicating her own sentiments to her readers. The tale of the heroic and successful efforts of Francis to win back the Chablais from Calvinism; of his intercourse with Henry of Navarre, whose lifelong esteem and favour he won; of his extraordinary spiritual relations with his own parents, to whom he acted as confessor and spiritual guide; of his direction of souls and characters so different as St. Jeanne de Chantal and Angelique Arnauld of Port-Royal, holds the reader under a continued spell. No one can come away from the reading of this biography without recognizing in Francis de Sales the highest ideal of the Christian gentleman, the holy priest, and the heroic saint.

ST. BRIDGET OF SWEDEN. By Francesa M. Steele. London: Washbourne, Ltd.

IN a preface the Rev. G. Browne, D.D., explains the very ancient Breviary of the Order of St. Saviour used by the Brigidine nuns for the past 665 years. It was compiled to St. Bridget's direction by the Cistercian monk, her friend and counsellor, Master Peter de Alvastra. For the life of St. Bridget the authoress consulted many authorities and spared no pains in research, but the result is somewhat bald and arid. We cannot say that we know St. Bridget: we do not understand the secret of her extraordinary personal influence; we are told the fact; we accept it; but we get no real spiritual leading from this biography.

BISHOP DE MAZENOD : HIS INNER LIFE AND VIRTUES.
By Very Rev. Eugene Baffie, O.M.I. With Portraits.
London : Washbourne, Ltd.


THIS is a full and lengthy biography, close on 500 pages, of the Founder of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Bishop C. J. Eugene de Mazenod, who died Bishop of Marseilles in 1861. It is translated from the French of Father Baffie, now Assistant-General of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. It is a work that in the original has had much vogue among the clergy and religious in France, and will be found useful and edifying reading by the clergy of the English-speaking world. It is the life of a man who practised the Gospel counsels of mortification, charity, and poverty, without ostentation to an heroic degree, whose zeal for souls was consuming, whose spirit of obedience was perfect, and whose rule as Bishop of Marseilles and founder of a religious congregation was exemplary.

THE STORY OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI. By M. Alice Heins,
Tertiary of St. Francis. London : Burns & Oates.

WITHIN the short compass of 80 pages the authoress has written a delightful story of the life of the Seraphic Francis. It is written for the young, but is sure to win many an older client to love the sweet Saint of Assisi. There are five excellent illustrations.

COMPANIONS OF THE WAY. Edited by Elizabeth Waterhouse. London : Methuen.

THIS is a collection of elegant extracts, moral and religious, in prose and poetry, from all kinds and conditions of authors for polite morning and evening reading for every day in the year.



IRENÆUS AND THE CHURCH OF ROME

IRENÆUS was born in Smyrna, or the adjoining district, probably between the years 130 and 140. His letter to Florinus¹ makes it clear that as a boy he enjoyed an intimate acquaintanceship with St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, and listened frequently to the aged bishop recounting the interesting details which he himself learned from St. John and others who had seen the Lord regarding His miracles and doctrine. From Smyrna Irenæus journeyed westward, and settled finally amongst the Christian community at Lyons, where his abilities and qualifications as a priest were soon universally recognized. The clergy of Lyons and Vienne entrusted him with a mission to Pope Eleutherius against the Montanist heresy, and on his return he was elected Bishop of Lyons, in succession to the martyred St. Pothinus.

As bishop he seems to have devoted himself specially to the work of exposing heresy, more particularly the heretical doctrines and principles put forward by the Gnostic parties. Against these he wrote his celebrated work, known generally under the title *Adversus Haereses*. The work was written originally in Greek, portion of it at least during the pontificate of Eleutherius (189-198), but only a few fragments of the original text have been preserved. The Latin

¹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, v. 22.

version, however, which has come down to us, was made at a very early period, and on account of its close agreement with the original, wherever the existing Greek fragments permit a comparison, as well as on account of the obvious effort made by the translator to preserve in his translation even the peculiar idioms of the Greek, it has been accepted by critics as completely reliable. It is in this work (Lib. iii. 2-3) that the much-discussed text regarding the position of the Church of Rome in the Christian society is to be found.¹

Without understanding the context, it is impossible for a person to determine the meaning which Irenæus wished to convey. In opposition to the Gnostics, who claimed a special revelation for some of their own more gifted leaders, and who consequently rejected both Scripture and tradition, Irenæus brings forward a simple test of orthodoxy, namely, an unbroken succession of bishops from the Apostles. In the Churches in which there is such an unbroken succession, in which, in other words, Apostolic succession is to be found, there also the true Apostolic tradition should be sought; for, surely, the Apostles confided the complete revelation which they themselves had received to the 'perfect' and 'blameless' men whom they selected to take their own places as teachers, and these men did likewise with those who were to follow in their footsteps. Hence, the true Christian teaching is not to be sought amongst scattered sects like the Gnostics, but in the Churches which can boast of an unbroken succession of bishops leading back to the Apostles of Christ. That his argument should be complete, he felt that it was necessary for him to give the lists of bishops in the great Churches, and, furthermore, to prove that they were at one in their teaching, that one and the same faith was professed by the entire Christian body. But he excuses himself from undertaking such a laborious work:—

Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximæ et antiquissimæ,

¹ In regard to Irenæus and his works, cf. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, 2 auf., pp. 105-110 (Eng. tr.); idem, *Gesch. d. Altchrist-Litteratur*, I. 496 ff.; Ehrhard, *Die Altchrist-Litteratur*, i. 262-75.

et omnibus cognitae, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romae fundatae et constitutae ecclesiae, eam quam habet ab apostolis traditionem, et annuntiatam hominibus fidem per successiones episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquo modo, vel per sibi placentiam, vel vanam gloriam vel per caecitatem et malam sententiam, praeterquam oportet colligunt. Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentio¹rem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea quae est ab apostolis traditio.²

He gives, then, a list of the Bishops of Rome, from the Apostles to Eleutherius—who was still reigning when he wrote this book (iii.)—and having thus proved an unbroken Apostolic succession for the Church of Rome, he adds:—

Hac ordinatione et successione, ea quae est ab Apostolis in Ecclesia traditio et veritatis praeconatio pervenit usque ad nos. Et est plenissima haec ostensio unam et eandem vivificatricem fidem esse, quae in Ecclesia ab Apostolis usque nunc sit conservata, et tradita in veritate.

Instead of enumerating the succession of bishops in the great Churches, Irenæus lays it down that he can more conveniently confound all his adversaries by showing an unbroken succession of bishops in the Church of Rome. By proving the Apostolic succession and the possession of the Apostolic tradition for the Roman Church, he thereby establishes that the other Churches hold by the Apostolic tradition; and, furthermore, that it is one and the same vivifying faith that is professed by the entire Church. Why,

¹ Codex Claromontanus, 'poñtiorem,' where obviously *n* is to be erased.

² In the *Revue Bénédicte* (Oct., 1908) Dom Morin suggests that the second *qui sunt undique* is due to an error of the copyist, and by copious references to other blunders of the same kind made by the copyist, he has gone far to justify his contention. In the same review (Jan., 1910), Father Herbigny, S.J., contends that the second *qui sunt undique* should read *qui sunt undecim* referring to the eleven Bishops of Rome whom Irenæus immediately enumerates.

In view of the absence of manuscript authority for these emendations, we have not adopted them.

one may naturally ask, does the writer maintain that by establishing apostolicity of doctrine in the Roman Church he necessarily vindicates the conformity of the faith of the entire Church with the Apostolic tradition? The answer to this question is supplied by Irenæus himself, in the sentence beginning '*Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potentiorum principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam,*' but the proper interpretation of this reason assigned by him has divided scholars for generations.

Most Protestant writers¹ translate the passage as follows: For to this Church on account of its superior pre-eminence (the fact that it was situated in the capital of the Empire) it must needs be that every Church should come, that is, the faithful from all sides, and in this Church the tradition from the Apostles has been always preserved by the faithful who flock there from all parts. This interpretation of the text, an interpretation which in recent times has found favour with certain Catholic writers,² is justified by the following reasons:

First, *convenire ad* in the New Testament always bears the meaning of 'motion to,' not of 'agreement with.' Second, the use of the word *undique*, not *ubique*, makes it clear that the second clause should be interpreted as meaning 'the faithful (who come) from all sides,' not 'the faithful who are everywhere. While in the third place the clause beginning *in qua* cannot be explained if *convenire ad* is taken as meaning 'agreement with.' Finally, it is urged that two Latin writers of the twelfth century seem to have understood this passage in the sense of 'coming to Rome, the capital of the Empire.'

That such an interpretation cannot be accepted, for the simple reason that it is not in harmony with the context, ought to be sufficiently clear from an examination of what precedes and of what follows. The unbroken succession of bishops from the Apostles is the simple test of the orthodoxy of any Church, proposed by Irenæus; the unbroken succession

¹ Cf. Salmon, *Infallibility*, p. 376; Gore, *Roman Claims*, p. 97.

² Turmel, *Histoire de la Papauté*, 39 ff.

in Rome is, according to him, a complete guarantee for the orthodoxy of the entire Church, and the clause beginning with *ad hanc enim ecclesiam* is the proof which he furnishes for this latter statement. How does the Protestant interpretation, namely, that the faithful must come to the capital of the Empire, and by their coming preserve the faith in Rome pure, afford any proof for the preceding statement? Besides, it would then be the people who preserve the faith pure, while the main point insisted on by Irenæus is, that it is by the Apostolic succession that the purity of faith is preserved, else why the triumphant statement made immediately after his enumeration of the Roman bishops, that 'by this ordination and succession of bishops the Apostolic tradition has come down to us, and that the unbroken succession in Rome is a most complete proof' (*plenissima ostensio*) that one and the same living faith is preserved in the Church from the Apostles till his own time.

It may be pointed out, too, that if *convenire ad* bears the meaning of 'motion to,' it is very strange that Irenæus should have said that the entire Church (*omnem ecclesiam*) must come to Rome, nor would he have given as a reason for their coming to Rome, the capital of the Empire, the *potentiolem principalitatem* of the Roman Church (*ad hanc enim ecclesiam*). In reply to the arguments used in support of this interpretation, it may be pointed out that *convenire ad* in patristic Latin bears both meanings, 'to come to,' or 'to agree with'; that *undique* is used in other places in this work where one might naturally expect *ubique*, e.g., i. 16, 2; iii. 2, 3; iii. 2, 8; that the clause beginning *in qua* can be better explained according to the other interpretation; and that, finally, whether the two twelfth-century writers refer to this passage of Irenæus or not—a question that cannot be answered confidently from the data—they were in no better position to arrive at the true meaning of the words of Irenæus than any modern author.

Harnack, whose authority on such matters is recognized by all sides, rejects as absurd the ordinary Protestant

interpretation.¹ *Convenire ad*, according to him, can have no other meaning in this context than 'to agree with.' Hence he would translate the first part of the sentence: For it is necessary for the entire Church, that is to say, the faithful who are everywhere (the qualifying clause being the method adopted by Irenæus to express the word *Catholica*), in which entire Church the Apostolic tradition has always been preserved by the faithful everywhere (this latter qualifying clause beginning with *in qua* being the phrase adopted by Irenæus to express the word *orthodoxa*) to agree with the Roman Church. Thus he interprets the entire passage as follows: For it is necessary for the entire Catholic and orthodox Church to agree with the Roman Church on account of its greater pre-eminence. Hence if Irenæus could prove the Apostolic succession, and consequently Apostolic tradition for the Roman Church, he thereby proved it for the entire orthodox Church; and, as he had boasted, by the mere enumeration of the Roman bishops from Peter and Paul to Eleutherius, he had confounded all his opponents.

It may well be asked does Harnack, then, admit that according to Irenæus the entire Church must necessarily agree in doctrine with the Roman Church, the very point upon which Catholic theologians lay such stress in discussing the Primacy of Rome? The answer to this must be in the negative. His contention is that Irenæus could have selected any of the great Apostolic Churches, e.g., Smyrna or Ephesus, and have argued equally well for his purpose from the unbroken succession in any of these Churches. *Principalitas* is understood by Harnack to be a translation of the Greek word *αυθεντια*, which might refer merely to the Apostolic origin of a Church and its consequent possession of complete Apostolic doctrine. He selected Rome simply because, as he states, it was the greatest, the oldest, the best known, the one founded by the two chief Apostles, Peter and Paul, all of which qualifications are summed up in the words *potentio-rem principalitatem*. Hence Rome is put before the others

¹ *Sitzungs-berichte der K. Pr. Akademie*, Nov. 1893; *Dogmengeschichte*, bd. i. p. 446.

merely because it is '*maxima, antiquissima omnibus cognita, a gloriosissimis Apostolis fundata et constituta.*' Besides, he argues, that *neesse est* does not mean a moral law or obligation. It does not represent the Greek *δέλ*, which the translator should have rendered by *oportet*, but *ἀνάγκη*, a word that implies what does actually happen rather than what must necessarily happen.

Now, against this method of interpreting the passage it must be remarked that while Harnack contends that all the Apostolic Churches were equal, and that Irenæus might have adopted equally well the unbroken succession in Ephesus to prove his case, yet Irenæus does not place Rome on an equality with the other great Church. He vindicates for it a *potentioorem principalitatem*, and it is precisely because Rome possesses this *potentioorem principalitatem* he states that the other Churches must agree with it. It has not merely *principalitatem*, like the other Apostolic Churches, but it has a *potentioorem principalitatem*. Nor can Harnack adduce any proof for the meaning which he assigns to *principalitas*—a meaning which cannot be supported by any parallel text in Irenæus, or, as far as can be seen, in any of the early Apostolic Fathers. In Irenæus it is used most frequently in reference to the Supreme Being in contradistinction to the Aons, and as indicating His superiority and pre-eminence. In Tertullian's work, *De Prescriptione adversus hereticos*, chapter xxxi., a parallel might be sought, but a fair examination of both contexts will suffice to convince most men that the meaning attached to the word by Tertullian is not the meaning given it by the translator of Irenæus. Of what Greek word *principalitas* is the translation cannot be known with certainty, unless the fragment of the original text is discovered. The word occurs in many other places in this work of Irenæus, but after a careful investigation I have failed to find an exact parallel for its use in the present passage. That it implies pre-eminence or authority is, however, clear; while the use of the qualifying comparative establishes the fact that it took rank above all, even the Apostolic, Churches.

Again, if the work be examined it will be found that the translator uses both *oportet* and *necesse est* indiscriminately, e.g., Lib. ii. 1 ; ii. 4 ; ii. 7 ; and besides, if *necesse est* implies merely what actually happens, not what must happen by law, it is difficult to see how Irenæus could have confounded the heretics by establishing the apostolicity of succession and doctrine in the Church of Rome, because they might very well retort that possibly the other Apostolic Churches were not in agreement with Rome. He anticipated this by laying down that they must be in agreement with Rome, and that therefore by vindicating the possession of Apostolic doctrine for Rome he has also shown that one and the same living faith as given by the Apostles is preserved in the entire Church. This line of argument is characterized by him as a *plenissima ostensio*, a complete proof of the unity of faith in the Church ; an epithet which was certainly misplaced if he spoke only of a *de facto* not of a *de jure* agreement.

Though most Catholic writers are in agreement about the general meaning of the text, yet they differ very much about the interpretation of the qualifying clauses. Some take the *in qua* to refer to the Roman Church, and then the meaning would be : It is necessary for the entire Church, that is, the faithful who are everywhere, to agree with the Roman Church, in which Roman Church the Apostolic tradition has been preserved by the faithful who are everywhere. Against this interpretation it is sufficient to point out that the sentence of Irenæus would thus be self-contradictory. In the first part it would be stated that the faithful who are everywhere must agree with Rome, while the second part would imply that Rome was dependent for its purity of doctrine on the faithful who are everywhere. It cannot be admitted for a moment that Irenæus could have been guilty of such a blundering statement in a sentence by which he intends to confound all his opponents.

Another interpretation put forward recently is that the Latin *in qua* is a literal translation of the Greek *ἐν ᾗ*, that is to say 'in which,' 'by which,' 'in communion with which.' The meaning would be, according to this explanation : It is

necessary for every Church to be in agreement with the Roman Church, by means of which (or in communion with which) the Apostolic tradition is always and everywhere preserved by the faithful.¹ This meaning would undoubtedly bring into bold relief the teaching authority and infallibility of the Roman Church, and would be in exact conformity with the prerogatives promised to St. Peter by our Lord, but at the same time it can be regarded at most as only a probable explanation.

That *in qua* refers to the ' *omnis ecclesia* ' and not to the ' *Romana ecclesia* ' is fairly evident. It seems to me that this relative clause contains a clear statement of what must have been underlying the argument of Irenæus, namely, the fact that the entire Church, or the union of all the great Apostolic Churches, could never cease to preserve pure the Apostolic doctrine. This doctrine is expressly laid down in Books iii. 24, 2; iv. 33, 8; v. 20, 1. Hence I should be inclined to take the sentence beginning with *in qua* not as a mere qualifying clause, but as introducing a statement of a fact which was required in order to complete the argument.

It should be noted that in this work Irenæus does not undertake formally to give us an exact statement of his views concerning the position of the Roman Church. The *Adversus Haereses* was written for an entirely different purpose, and therefore we cannot expect to find in it as definite and complete a statement about Rome as we might expect to get had he composed a treatise *De Romano Pontifice*. But if his line of argument be examined closely it will be seen that he vindicates for Rome a super-eminent position amongst the Churches which compose the Christian society.

Against the heretics who, not content with rejecting the Scriptures, proceed to attack tradition, he lays down: (1) The true Apostolic tradition ought surely to be found in the Churches which can boast of an uninterrupted succession from the Apostles. (2) It would be too long to trace the succession of bishops in the great Churches from

¹ Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, p. 108.

the Apostles, but to confound his opponents it is quite sufficient to trace the succession in the oldest, greatest, and best known, namely, Rome. (3) For it is necessary for every Church, that is, the entire Christian body, to be in agreement with Rome, on account of its greater power, and therefore by vindicating apostolicity of doctrine for the Roman Church he vindicates it for the entire Christian society. (4) The list of Roman bishops, from the Apostles to Eleutherius, '*[qui] nunc duodeccimo loco episcopatum ab apostolis habet,*' is given in proof of the Apostolic succession in the Roman Church. (5) He concludes that by this ordination and succession of bishops the tradition which is in the Church from the Apostles came down to his days in the Roman Church. (6) And bearing in mind the harmony which must exist between the other Churches and Rome, he boldly asserts that he has thus proved most completely that the faith which is in the Church from the Apostles, and which has been preserved in truth to his own day, is one and the same living faith.

From this line of argument it is sufficiently clear that Irenæus acknowledged the pre-eminence of the Roman Church, and the absolute necessity for the other Churches to be in agreement with it if they wished to preserve Apostolic doctrine. Besides, it should be noted that Irenæus in another portion of his work (Book iii. 24, 2), according to the most probable reading, assigns as a reason for the divisions amongst the heretical sects the fact that they are not founded upon a *rock* but upon sand. In other words, he seems to refer in the famous text of St. Matthew regarding the promise made to St. Peter, and to regard the See of St. Peter as the cause of the unity of the Church. This would fit in exactly with the interpretation that has been given of the text under discussion by most Catholic writers. Did he, therefore, imply that the Roman Church was an infallible guide?

Irenæus does not explicitly raise the question of the infallibility of the Roman See. But he certainly put forward the infallibility of the Church, as his line of argument clearly shows. If, for instance, it had been objected

to him by his opponents that the presence of an uninterrupted succession of bishops from the Apostles in all the great Churches of the Christian community was not any guarantee for the possession of true Apostolic doctrine, for the simple reason that some of the bishops in the line of succession might have erred and led their Church astray, he would have replied, as he does reply, that one must look to the teaching of the entire body and regard the individual or churches which separate themselves from the main body as heretical.¹ He assumes all the time that the Church itself cannot lose possession of the Apostolic tradition, and is, therefore, in this sense infallible. Speaking of this body in contradistinction to these who fall away, he lays it down²: '*Quapropter eis qui in Ecclesia sunt, presbyteris obaudire oportet his qui successionem habent ab apostolis sicut ostendimus, qui cum episcopatus successione charisma veritatis certum secundum placitum Patris acceperunt.*'

The body of bishops, therefore—he cannot refer to individuals, for he admits that individuals can fall away—has received the *charisma veritatis*, according to the will of the Father. This is a clear statement of the infallibility of the Church, and similar statements are to be found in Books iii. 24; iv. 33; v. 20. If this be so, and if at the same time every Church must be in agreement with Rome, and if Rome be the origin of Christian unity, it necessarily follows that the Roman Church cannot err in regard to Apostolic tradition.

JAMES MACCAFFREY.

¹ Lib. iv. 24, 2.

² Ibid.

EDUCATION IN SPAIN

THERE is hardly a single institution in Spain that is not made the object of attacks by anti-Catholic writers from time to time. Most of these attacks are the outcome of bigotry, prejudice, or ignorance; and did Spain receive praise from such sources, it were time she examined her conscience. Her educational system has not escaped, and though it may have its defects, it is not the sad affair its enemies would have one believe. The Spaniards are a proud and haughty race, and despise these attacks; they disdain to right themselves before a malicious foe, but it is well for outside Catholics to know the real state of affairs. In this paper I hope to give what must be, at best, only a hurried description of the Spanish educational system in all its departments.

Spain could always boast of prominent figures in the fields of literature and science; and it would be strange if she became false to her old tradition in the beginning of the twentieth century. Soon after getting possession of the Latin tongue the Spanish writers became the formidable rivals of the Romans themselves.¹ The two Senecas, Martial, Lucan, Quintillian, were some of Spain's intellectual offering to the Empire, and for some time the vigour, humour, and lavish ornament of the provincial school seemed to give new life to the decadent Latin literature. We still have the poetical Gospels of Juvencus, claimed by the Spaniards as the first Christian poet, and the exquisite verses of the fervent Prudentius. Later, St. Isidore of Seville was a good type of a large number of Spanish scholars,² who are the admiration of posterity for the variety and profundity of their learning. Even under Moslem rule letters continued to flourish in Spain, and the schools of Cordova, Toledo, Seville, and Zaragoza attracted students

¹ Cf. Hume, *The Spanish People*, chap. ii. p. 34.

² Cf. Bardenhewer, *Patrology*, under Orosius, St. Braulius, St. Eugenius, etc.

from all parts of the world.¹ At Cordova lived the famous Averroës, regarded as the greatest of all Arabian commentators on Aristotle.² From the thirteenth century onwards the University of Salamanca³ held the lamp of learning high and well-trimmed, and proved itself a worthy rival of Paris, Oxford, and Bologna. But my object is not to chant a pæan in honour of Spain's literary triumphs in the past, but to describe her labours in the cause of education at the present time.

In studying the educational system in Spain it is well, for the sake of clearness, to follow the time-honoured distinction of University, Secondary, and Primary Education. The ordinary Spaniard does not lack opportunities for receiving a University education ; for the fees, at all times small, may vanish entirely in the case of a brilliant student, and there are no less than ten Universities scattered over the country. They are found in the following cities, each of which in turn gives its name to the University : Barcelona, Granada, Madrid, Oviedo, Salamanca, Santiago, Seville, Valencia, Valladolid, and Zaragoza. Of these the most perfectly organized is the University of Madrid, not merely because it teaches more branches than any other University, but chiefly because it is the only University in Spain which now can confer the doctorate in the lay faculties. Here we see the tendency to exalt Madrid at the expense of the other capitals. Since the time of Philip II. the aim of Spanish politicians has been to concentrate all power in Madrid. Philip changed the capital from Valladolid to the geographical centre of Spain so that he could make the royal authority more easily felt in the remotest corners of the Peninsula. The attributes of autocratic royalty in olden times are now enjoyed by the King's ministers: but we shall see more of this in dealing with the Minister of Public Instruction.

The faculties taught in the Spanish Universities are : (1) Philosophy and Literature ; (2) Science ; (3) Law ; (4) Medicine ; and (5) Pharmacy.

¹ Cf. Hume, *The Spanish People*, chap. iv. p. 109.

² Cf. Turner, *History of Philosophy*, p. 313.

³ Cf. Vidal, *Memoria Historica de la Universidad de Salamanca*, passim.

The faculty of Philosophy is divided into three sections, namely, Philosophy, Literature, and History; and the faculty of Science is divided into (a) Exact Sciences; (b) Physical; (c) Chemical; and (d) Natural.¹ A student may take a distinct degree in any of the divisions. The Madrid University teaches the five faculties and all their divisions; Barcelona covers the same ground, with the exception of the two sections Philosophy and Natural Sciences, and the doctorates, of course. The other Universities are practically equal in the extent of their programmes (less than the two named), with the exception of Oviedo, which teaches only the faculty of Law, and the preparatory course in Philosophy and Literature, and a similar course in the faculty of Science.

Every item of expense, from the rector's salary to the chalk for the black-board, is met by the State; but, on the contrary, the State expects the University to refund every penny it receives in the shape of matriculation fees and degree moneys. As a matter of fact, the four Universities of Madrid, Barcelona, Santiago, and Valladolid return more money than the State spends on them, while in the other six the expenses are greater than the income. It may be interesting to those engaged in University work to give the expenses of each University in Spain, and also the amount of fees paid by the students, all which go to the State:—

	Fees Received Pesetas	Expenses Pesetas
Madrid . . .	1,045,785	847,227
Barcelona . . .	454,676	387,347
Granada . . .	243,083	288,703
Oviedo . . .	53,773	118,462
Salamanca . . .	171,751	242,752
Santiago . . .	306,622	252,538
Seville . . .	294,784	373,668
Valencia . . .	250,571	269,120
Valladolid . . .	359,860	236,736
Zaragoza . . .	222,674	292,251 ²

¹ *Anuario Estadístico de Instrucción Pública*, p. 33.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 498, 499.

If one divides by 25, all these numbers can be reduced to pounds sterling. I have omitted in each case the céntimos, or tenths of a penny. From these statistics we see that instead of spending any money on University education the Government makes, roughly, about £3,800 by the work of the Universities; and this is not the saddest aspect of the matter. Until the middle of the last century the older Universities, like Salamanca, had a large amount of corporate property, of which the State relieved them completely, making it illegal for them to hold property; so that now they are without their properties and earnings. This conduct of the Government is indefensible, but the politicians so will it and so it is. This is one of the many reasons why the ordinary Spaniard looks never upon his rulers with sympathy. But the professors who continue to work conscientiously, in the absence of all generous consideration, deserve all the more honour and praise.

It is freely admitted on all sides that there are too many Universities in Spain, and that the number could be reduced to one-half, with advantage both to the teaching staff and the pupils. But the suppression of a University in any city would arouse the most vehement opposition from local elements; hence it is highly improbable that any of them will be interfered with, as the great concern of every government is to keep the people pleased, no matter at what cost.

The Universities enjoy no immunity from the common law: they hold no courts to inquire into and punish students' offences, for which they are amenable to the civil courts like any ordinary citizen. The usual means of punishing a student for unjustifiable absence from class or misconduct of any kind is to remove his name from the matriculation list for that year. Amongst the *personnel* of education the figure that looms largest is that of the Minister of Public Instruction. It is hardly necessary to add that I refer to no individual, but to the office. The Minister makes all appointments, from that of the rector of the central University to the master of the smallest village school. He is assisted by a council of fifty, a goodly proportion of whom

are politicians from the Senate or Congress. The Bishop of Madrid, the Sub-Secretary of the Ministry, and the Rector of the Madrid University are *ex-officio* members, and there are three corresponding members from each of the ten Universities, namely, the rector and two other professors. The Council is divided into five committees, which, between them, cover the whole range of educational affairs, including schools of commerce, veterinary, training colleges, fine arts, arts and industries, etc. One member of the council has the right of being present and voting at the concursus for chairs in the Universities. Finally, under the ægis of the Minister, figure a committee of noble ladies, presided over by H.R.H. the Infanta Isabella, interested in primary education, and the eight Spanish Academies, with the Athenæum of Madrid. Brilliant work is done in the Academies, more especially by the members in their entrance discourse.

This array of educational committees and societies is imposing, but their influence on the actual education of the country is not great. The members that are politicians are far more concerned for questions of State or party. Even the Minister is selected by exigencies of the party rather than by any special capability for directing all the educational institutions of the country. That he does not always give satisfaction may be inferred from the complaints we read from time to time in the Press. It must be conceded that he has a difficult task, for if an improvement is granted in one University all the others are up in arms; and so different are the climates and characters of the many regions in Spain that the same *modus agendi* will rarely give satisfaction to all. How much better it would be to grant a large measure of Home Rule to the Universities, and allow their senates to discover the best ways and means of placing their *Alma Mater* in the front rank.

The Rector of the University is always one of the professors, and is selected at will by the Minister. As head of the University he can exert very little influence on the course of studies: he has no power of initiative, and must

limit himself to carrying out the dispositions of the actual Minister and those who went before him. He is also removable at the will of the Minister, but is not usually interfered with unless a good reason exists; however, obeying the usual law of 'flux' in things Spanish,¹ reasons do turn up; and the actual Rector of the University of Salamanca, though only counting ten years in office, is the senior of all the others. The rector gets a free house and an addition of £40 to his salary. His chief duty as rector consists in managing the affairs of education in his district; as delegate of the Minister he is the head of University, Secondary, and Primary education, and his offices are an education department on a small scale. There is no use in his discussing schemes for the advancement of education; for neither the power to carry out reforms nor the necessary funds exist in the University itself.

The chairs at the University and the auxiliary professorships are given as a result of a public concursus, always held in Madrid. In case of a notability, whose eminence is universally recognized, a chair may be given without any examination. Once appointed the professor enjoys unlimited freedom of thought and action, the only restriction being that he must not teach anything contrary to the Catholic religion. If a professor disobeys, the Bishops have, by the Concordat, the right of denouncing him to the Minister of Public Instruction. It is very hard to bring a professor to task, even though he teaches nothing in his class. I do not suppose for a moment that there are such; but the only individual having any real power is the Minister, and he is far away. A Spanish University rector² told me once that the most accurate definition of a professor in matters pertaining to his class is 'His Majesty the Professor.' Despite this great freedom it is to the credit of the body that not merely do they attend to their duties, but are enthusiastic in their fulfilment. When a man gains an auxiliary professorship he does not pass on to be a professor in the course of years, but must win a second concursus if

¹ Cf. I. E. RECORD, January, 1911, p. 69.

² Señor Don Miguel de Unomuno, Rector of Salamanca University.
VOL. XXIX.—16

he desires to enter the ranks of the professorate. In the case of successful teachers, there is no excuse for this arrangement, as the examination for auxiliaries is more trying, because more extensive, than that for professorships, and a proved aptitude for teaching is much more valuable than a brilliant display at an examination. How much better it would be if their promotion depended largely on the University authorities, who are directly concerned in procuring and retaining the best man? The salaries of the auxiliary professors are also very small, generally about £50 or £60, according to the subject; so that they are agitating at the present time, very justly, for an increase in salary and promotion to the professorate in the order of seniority.

Despite the high taxation in Spain—20 per cent. on Government Stock—the country is always short of money, on account of the great number of officials. The effect of this on the Universities is that some classes are left without a professor for years. Such a class is handed over to the professor of a kindred subject in the same faculty, and he gets two-thirds of the salary, in addition to his own. Up to the present the initial salary of a professor has been £120, and in case he has a second class, called an *acumulacion*, he gets an additional £80. Such a salary is quite inadequate for a man who has to live as a distinguished member of society and at the same time support and educate a numerous family. Hence it is not surprising to see them turning to other means in order to increase the family income. I should say that fully one-half of the professors are engaged in other pursuits in addition to their classes. But despite their divided attention and their short time for study, it is wonderful what their natural abilities and prodigious memory can do for the enlightenment of their pupils. When a Spanish professor devotes himself entirely to his subject, he seldom fails to establish a reputation for himself.¹ The name of Dr. Cajal, of Madrid, is familiar in the medical centres in Dublin; Señor Altamira, of Oviedo, has

¹ Cf. Fitzmaurice Kelly, *Spanish Literature*, under Alas, Echegaray, Hinojosa, Azcárate, etc.

reaped fame as a historian ; the extraordinary scholarship of Menedez Pelayo¹ is the admiration of the world ; and the writings of a Salamanca professor of law are highly esteemed by the followers of a certain school of thought.

The system of increasing the salaries of the University professors is known as the *escalafon*. There are some 450 professors between all the Universities, and they are divided into ten sections of various numbers. A different arrangement was in vogue up to a few months ago, when the initial salary was raised and the present system introduced. Now every professor starts with £160, and as the senior members leave the service, those who come after them move into the next higher sections with increases of £40, until they reach £500.

The University professor in Spain enjoys great respect amongst his fellow-citizens, and no honour or office is considered too good for them. They frequently take an active part in the conduct of municipal and provincial affairs, and they count something like seventeen Senators among their number, while they have even a larger representation in the Congress. When a professor enters Parliament he gives up his class for the time being, only receiving two-thirds of the salary ; and the auxiliary professor takes charge of his subject. A professor who is a senator continues to teach as usual, for the sessions of the Senate are much less frequent than those of the Congresses. Each University has the privilege of electing a senator, and all the doctors in any faculty, who are affiliated to the University, have the right of voting. The professors vote in their capacity of doctors, as all, even the auxiliaries, must have taken the *laurea*.

The professors are not by any means an exclusive set. In this they follow the well-known democratic spirit of the nation.² The only time spent together is the few minutes before and after class in the common room at the University. When not studying they spend their evening with their families, and frequently go to the café, where they meet

¹ Cf. Fitzmaurice Kelly, *Spanish Literature*, p. 397.

² Cf. Boyle O'Reilly, *Heroic Spain*, p. 428.

their friends of the other professions, the military, and the better-class merchants. There is a very useful institution, by which the professors are relieved from their classes for a year, and in addition to the usual salary get £160 : it is a sort of travelling scholarship, with which they are expected to improve themselves by studying the methods employed at foreign Universities. They are required to write an account of their studies and present it to the Minister some time after returning. A professor may enjoy them at any age and more than once. There is no definite rule for granting them, and the acquisition of a travelling scholarship depends largely on the good-will of the Minister and those who advise him. In former times the Spanish Universities were pre-eminently Catholic, and all the sacred sciences held a foremost place in the curriculum. For two hundred years before the definition of the Immaculate Conception every individual, before taking possession of his chair at the University of Salamanca or his stall in the Cathedral, was bound to take an oath to defend its truth, though not a dogma during all that time. During the last century the Carlists claimed for themselves exclusively the title of 'Catholicos Apostolicos Romanos,' and the other side was swelled by all the anti-clericals and indifferentists. To please this section, in 1868, when the Carlists were reaching their last barricades and the country entering on a state of anarchy, the teaching of all the sacred sciences, except Canon Law, was abolished. Still, despite the fact that you meet rarely a professing atheist, on the whole the professors are an exemplary body of serious, sincere Catholics ; and at Salamanca, at least, it is very edifying to see them in their doctor's robes, keeping guard in pairs before the Blessed Sacrament, on Holy Thursday and Good Friday morning. There are several priests among the professors : they get no favours, but must win their chairs in exactly the same way as the lay professors.

When a chair becomes vacant in a university any professor of the same subject in the other universities may occupy it in order of seniority : if no one applies for it then only is a concursus held to cover the vacancy.

Turning to the University students, it may be of interest to give some statistics of the numbers attending the various Universities. Male and female nurses are numbered with the students, although they take no degree. In 1906-1907 these were 348. I take the following statistics from the Report published by the Minister of Public Instruction, and it refers to the academic year 1906-7 :—

Madrid	4,634
Barcelona	2,698
Granada	1,028
Oviedo	1,291
Salamanca	827
Santiago	1,189
Seville	1,055
Valencia	1,169
Valladolid	1,316
Zaragoza	793
TOTAL					15,000 ¹

What strikes one most forcibly in making an examination of the conditions of Spanish student life is the extraordinary liberty they have with regard to lectures, and the complete absence of boarding colleges in connexion with the Universities. It is hardly necessary to dilate on the loss sustained by the students through not living in community. Each student is allowed to regulate his own life—one studies more than he ought in all prudence, others go to the opposite extreme. The professors exercise no control on the students outside the class-room, and this is calculated to diminish that wholesome fear and reverence which conduce so much to effective work in the lecture hall. It is as well, however, for the Government that it has not incurred the expense of erecting hostels, because Spanish parents would not be prepared to allow their children to enter them without the supervision of some religious Order; and the vacillating Ministers would hardly venture to rouse the anti-clerics by permitting such a state of things. The students as

¹ *Anuario Estadístico*, etc., p. 487.

members of the University have no clubs or societies of any kind, with the exception of a string band, with which they make excursions to other cities during the Carnival. One wonders how they manage to be so healthy while taking practically no exercise. There is no such thing as a football team, no hurling, cricket, or tennis, and hand-ball, the most common exercise in Spain, must be sought for in some of the city courts.

How different is the life of a student in the great Jesuit College in Bilbao, for example. I went over the establishment with the greatest delight during the Summer vacation some years ago. 'The University,' as it is called in Bilbao, is large and artistically constructed. It occupies a beautiful site between the mountains and the river which connects Bilbao with the sea. I saw clean, airy rooms, large, well-equipped class halls, a valuable modern library and theatre, roomy refectories, billiard-rooms, bath-rooms, promenades, recreation grounds, and several ball-courts. The students have the assistance of experienced masters to guide their studies; they have set hours for every duty, and are preserved from the dangers and idleness of the city streets. The better-class students either stay in their parents' home or frequent such colleges; the poorer ones live in humble lodgings in some University town, and work hard under difficulties until they can take their degree. The poor student has every incentive to hard work; for not merely may he get all his lectures free, but also attain to the highest position in his own or any other University in Spain. There are many examples of poor boys becoming professors very soon after the completion of their University career. There is an accurate account kept of every honour the student receives, and the *hoja de meritos*, or 'page of merits,' is a very formidable asset in trying for any position afterwards. The result of an examination may be any of five different marks: *suspensio* means 'failure'; *aprobado*, 'a satisfactory knowledge'; *notable*, 'very good'; *sobresaliente*, 'excellent'; and when a student displays exceptional knowledge he receives a *matricula de honor*, which carries with it the privilege of free lectures during the

ensuing year. In the same way a student, when taking his degree, may save himself from paying the ordinary heavy fine by making a brilliant display. The matriculation fee for each subject is approximately £1 5s., with eight shillings extra for practical work in the faculties of Medicine and Science.

Even when a student takes four subjects he gets his year at the University for about £5, which cannot be considered expensive. The degree of Licentiate in Literature or Science costs £24, and the same degree in Medicine, Law, or Pharmacy costs £34. The vast majority of the graduates rest content with the licentiate : for instance, country doctors, lawyers, chemists, etc. ; and generally students only take the doctorate when it is necessary for taking possession of some office, such as a professorship at one of the Universities.

The students enjoy the most extraordinary freedom in the matter of taking out lectures, if they do not matriculate as 'official' students of the University. The 'official' student is on the professor's list ; he is bound to attend every lecture and is called in class repeatedly, but he has the privilege of getting his mark without any examination, if he gives satisfaction during the year. The 'non-official' student is not bound to any lectures, but, on the contrary, he has to submit to an examination before a tribunal of three professors at the end of the year. Some of these students study privately, some in the Jesuit and Augustinian colleges, where their faculty is taught, and others attend the lectures in the University whenever they are in the humour. This third section is made up of boys who are clever, but lazy and perhaps a bit wild. If they became 'official' students and did not attend lectures they would be plucked for non-attendance ; and if they were present without having prepared, they would be plucked for want of knowledge ; so they stick to their liberty and amusements, and trust to a month's hard work before the examination to carry them through.

There are many other reasons for undergraduates desiring to remain free students, but it would be tedious to go into them all at present. The importance of this section

of Spanish University students may be gathered from the fact that in 1906-7, out of the 15,000 students whose names got on the books of the Universities, 6,038 were non-official or free students. As might be expected, the 'free' student does not get through the course as successfully as his official brother. In the statistics¹ before me 8,957 official students presented themselves in 30,129 subjects, and the result was: 4,957 excellent, 5,520 very good, 14,229 satisfactory, 2,929 failures; the remainder are returned as having lost the course. On the other hand, 6,038 free students presented themselves in 16,967 subjects, with the following result: 1,165 excellent, 2,298 very good, 8,562 satisfactory, 3,393 failures, 4,942 lost courses.

From these statistics it is impossible to appreciate the work done by the University colleges taught by the religious Orders; but taking into consideration the merry character of the non-collegiate free students, I should be inclined to credit the colleges with most of the honours appearing in the non-official list. A good college in connexion with a University is quite intelligible, but this system of stray students taking degrees without lectures will hardly appeal to any lover of education. At the same time it is quite in accord with the kind-hearted charity of the Spanish character, making provision at one time for the poor boy who cannot afford even a cheap lodging beside the University, again for the delicate boy who cannot leave his mother's loving care, and so on.

Deep learned are the poor in many ways,

Their hearts are mellowed by sweet human pain,
And she has learned the lesson of the waifs—

This sadly-ravaged, stern, soul-moving Spain.²

In a late session of Parliament Señor Canalejas declared that all Spaniards are inclined to be rebellious, and the students seem to be no exception to the general public. When they want anything they demand it with no uncertain voice, and back up the request with vigorous action. Some

¹ *Anuario Estadístico*, etc., pp. 486, 487.

² E. Boyle O'Reilly.

troubles with the authorities in Salamanca, on April 2, 1903, had the sad result of two students being shot dead by the Civil Guards; a few months ago, in Madrid, the students secured the resignation of the Chief of Police, because his subordinates ejected some of their comrades who protested against a play in one of the theatres; and later still want of harmony with the students in Zaragoza caused the resignation of the rector of that University.

But these are only momentary outbursts, though they will continue to manifest themselves to the end of the chapter; and at ordinary times the University student in Spain is a bright, gay, good-humoured, polite young fellow, full of the joy of life and ever ready to be of service, without any false shame, to those with whom he comes into contact. The last statistics I have given show by the number of failures that the masters hold the reins of justice rather tightly; while the honours' number vindicates brilliantly the recognized fame of Spain's talented youth.

If further proof be wanted of the worth of the Spanish students it is abundantly furnished by their magnificent display of knowledge when contending for chairs in the concursus, which are veritable tourneys of intellectual prowess. When the critic again feels inclined to dwell on the defects of Spanish education, let him remember what Spain has suffered in the last century—plundered by Bonapartes, wounded almost to death by the parricidal Carlist wars, robbed of her reason by the wretched Republican fiasco, and still bleeding after the disasters of the American war. But now, self-centred, there is hope for Spain:—

Reward must come: perhaps from her to-day
 May spring the needed saint to think, to feel,
 To march triumphantly, to point the way
 To altars where both Faith and Science kneel.
 Upon her ashy mountain height she stands
 Eager to step into the forward strife,
 Her eyes are wide with hope, outstretched her hands
 To meet the promise of new coursing life.¹

¹ E. Boyle O'Reilly, *Historic Spain*, p. 12.

Enough has been said to enable my readers to form an idea of Spanish University education. In some future number, *Deo volente*, I shall give a description of the other two sections of Spanish education, with the kind permission of the Editor.

M. J. O'DOHERTY.

'NON-CATHOLIC DENOMINATIONS'¹

FEW will be disposed to deny that a general knowledge of the history and tenets of the various non-Catholic sects is of great importance for the missionary priest. Not only may he be reasonably expected, as a man of education, to know and appreciate the position of those with whom he is so often brought into contact, but, especially in the present improved condition of the Catholic Church, he is constantly called upon to exercise missionary functions that, in the absence of such knowledge, are rendered exceedingly difficult. This is, of course, particularly true of countries where the relations between the various religious bodies are more intimate, and the mutual influence on one another more pronounced, than they are with us. But even to our own country, with its definite lines of cleavage and the antagonism born of centuries of civil and religious strife, it applies in some degree.

Unfortunately, until recent years, our ordinary manuals of theology gave us little help in this direction. They emanated from Continental sources, or were fashioned on Continental models, and in consequence failed to emphasize the points of view and lines of thought with which the writers of the French or Italian or German schools were comparatively unfamiliar. And it must be granted that not a few laboured under the serious defect of directing the students' mind almost exclusively to the dead and buried heresies of centuries ago, leaving the errors of the present day almost untouched. The result was what might have been expected. The student was thoroughly conversant with every phase of the heretical movements that troubled the Church's rulers in the past. But of the religious movements in contemporary life, of the peculiar doctrines associated with the numerous sects into which Protestantism

¹ *Non-Catholic Denominations.* By the Rev. Robert Hugh Benson M.A. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1910.

has naturally dissolved, of the trend and tendency of modern thought and the recent developments of non-Catholic apologetics, his knowledge was sadly limited.

Not that the study of the ancient heresies should have been neglected. The heretics are dead and gone, but their heresies remain : and it is on the great principles of faith that carried SS. Augustine and Jerome and Chrysostom to victory that we must rely in our struggles of the moment, and that our successors, we are sure, will rely in controversies still to come. It is quite astonishing, indeed, to find how closely the old errors are paralleled in modern England, and how in our own Church the most 'modern' error of all was in reality so very old that it could fittingly be described by the Holy Father as the 'synthesis of all the heresies.' But, after all, an acquaintance with theological principles is no more a sufficient equipment for the priest in his daily work than is the knowledge of mathematical axioms for the scientist in his solution of the complicated problems of practical life. If there be nothing new under the sun, the combinations of previously existing units are endless. And it is with the full force of these combinations, not with the separate units as such, that we are called upon to deal. It is the complicated thoughts of modern life and their composite results, not merely the broad principles that underlie them all, that the missionary priest finds himself forced to meet.

To fill up the lacunæ of his dogmatic text-book, and acquire a working knowledge of the Protestant sects in their present stage of development, the student has hitherto had to consult such works as Marsden's *Dictionary of Christian Churches and Sects* (London, 1854), or *The Religions of the World*, a composite work by members of the different Churches (London, 1872) ; or Blunt's *Dictionary of Sects and Heresies and Schools of Thought* (London, 1874), or, finally, the 'Confessions' and catechisms of the principal sects, published at various times and places. The labour involved was considerable ; nor were the results always satisfactory, for little information could be gleaned from any of these sources on the more recent phases of

theological thought. The defect has to a great extent been remedied by a recent publication of the Westminster Series, which we welcome cordially, and are glad to recommend to our readers' attention—a little book on 'Non-Catholic Denominations,' by the distinguished convert, Father Benson. He speaks with all the authority of a man closely in touch with the movements he describes, and indicates all along the arguments and suggestions that, as he knows from personal experience, are likely to appeal with greatest force to the peculiar temperaments of the various sects. To convey an idea of the interesting information the book contains we intend in the following pages to give a brief résumé of its contents, adding here and there a few historical details.

In the Protestant sects as a whole, and sometimes within the limits of a single one, we find various shades and degrees of belief, ranging from a scarcely veiled paganism to a system of doctrine that can hardly be distinguished from that of the Catholic Church. The rules of faith and canons of criticism to which they appeal are nearly as numerous as the sects themselves or the conflicting doctrines they hold. It would be a serious mistake, for instance, to regard all Protestant denominations as committed, in theory at least, to the principles of private judgment. The great majority, in fact, acknowledge an authority of some kind—vague, perhaps, and undefined, but an authority nevertheless—and only err in substituting for that established by Christ one of their own selection.

The Established Church of England is naturally the first that claims the author's attention, not merely because of its historical interest and of the number of its adherents, but also because we find in it nearly every shade of belief characteristic of modern Protestantism. It was no part of the intention of its founders to break with the principle of authority: their object was to substitute a National for a Universal Church, and the power of Convocation, with the King at its head, for that of the Roman Pontiff. In the person of the sovereign the two great departments—Church and State—met and were united: the Head of the State

was invested with a sacred character, somewhat like the kings in the Jewish dispensation who occasionally ministered in almost priestly functions. The ideal was preserved for a time, but as years went by, political influences grew too strong, and the powers once wielded by Convocation have now devolved on Parliament and, in a still greater degree, on the Privy Council. The vagueness of definition, deliberately aimed at by the original founders with a view to bringing as many as possible within the fold, has had its inevitable result. The Church has no definite doctrine.

It is possible to find within the limits of a stone's throw one Anglican divine who preaches practically the entire cycle of Catholic doctrine with the exception of that bearing upon the prerogative of Peter; another who denies in scarcely veiled language the corporal Resurrection of Jesus Christ as well as His birth of a virgin; another whose utterances are so calculated and obscure as to defy reasonable analysis.¹

The atmosphere of the clerical colleges varies from that of the 'prayer-meetings' and 'Scripture unions' to that of a Catholic monastic seminary. Moral Theology is excluded—though essential for the duties which some of the clergy feel themselves called upon to assume. As for dogma, 'it may be said almost without exaggeration that there is not one dogmatic text-book recognized simultaneously by all the Bishops nor one author satisfactory to the entire Bench.'¹ The Church is divided into sects, or schools of thought, that have little in common beyond a belief in the most fundamental dogmas and a desire to adhere to the Establishment for reasons of peace and convenience.

Among these schools of thought one of the most prominent, from the point of view of religious activity, is the 'Historic High Church Party.' Its appeal lies to the teaching of the Primitive Church. The Christian religion was, its leaders grant, pure at first, but the Roman See gradually encroached on its rivals' privileges and assumed

¹ Benson, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

² *Ibid.*, p. 8.

unwarranted powers. The converted barbarians carried their pagan practices into the fold of Christ ; and the reverence for Greek philosophy led to a hopelessly over-refined definition of the simple data of Gospel truth. The duty, therefore, of Christian England is to purge theology of 'Romish' errors, by adopting the more primitive standard furnished by the three Creeds and the definitions of the early Councils. Their doctrine, as we might expect, is often vague and uncertain : on the Sacraments, for instance, on the Communion of Saints, or on the state of the faithful departed, their views are dim and their statements confusing. Yet, hampered as they are by their determination to throw away the fruits of over a thousand years of Christian experience, they deserve in their honest efforts our sympathy and respect. They proclaim, in the face of ridicule, the truth as far as they know it ; their sincerity is undoubted, and their writings, as well as their religious ceremonies, are characterized by a quiet dignity not unworthy of the best traditions of Christian life.

But their doctrine, vague as it is, is not vague enough for the 'Moderate' High Churchman. For him Christianity is not so much a body of doctrine as a frame of mind or a tendency of thought. He accepts, in a wide sense, the doctrines of the Primitive Church, but, if difficulties arise, is far from enthusiastic about carrying them out in practice. His sympathy with the people is so intense that he is prepared, at the bidding of Parliament, to sacrifice, with little or no protest, the cherished beliefs of centuries. The characteristic of his position in fact is this that he is not merely unwilling to define his belief, but regards it as essentially undefinable.

There is no hesitancy of the kind about the 'Low' Church Party, including the 'Church of Ireland' now outside the Establishment. The average member regards episcopacy as desirable but by no means necessary, nor is he prepared to admit any essential difference between the qualifications of the parson and those of the people to whom he ministers. He has a sublime disregard, not to say contempt, for the teaching of the early Fathers, and takes his

stand on the Bible alone as interpreted by private judgment. The idea of a sacrifice or of a sacrificing priest in the present dispensation is repugnant to all his instincts. On the fundamental truths of the Existence of God, the Divinity of Christ, His Virgin Birth, Atonement, Resurrection, and Ascension he is orthodox enough, but his belief in Justification by Faith renders further sympathy with the Catholic position impossible. He has a close acquaintance with the Scripture texts that seem to prove his peculiar doctrines and 'can discharge them with extraordinary rapidity and accuracy of aim.' His attitude towards Rome is marked by none of the tolerance or admiration shown occasionally by his High Church brethren ; for him

the Catholic Church is the abomination of desolation—a scheme of thought so utterly apostate from true Christianity as to have become practically the supreme enemy of the Gospel—all the more dangerous because it is clothed in the garments of religion : a scheme of thought, too, so utterly absurd, so obviously un-Christian, so evidently worldly and corrupt as scarcely to need refutation.¹

In the Sacraments he has little or no belief : he denies the name to all of them except two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper ; and even they merely symbolize the inner grace of conversion. To the one he denies all power of spiritual regeneration, in the other he refuses to recognize the Real Presence. The ceremonies associated with their administration exhibit, perhaps, best of all the limits of his belief in their efficacy :—

The font is generally not used as was intended ; there is placed within it a small bowl of water with which the rite is performed. Nor is there any kind of punctiliousness as to the administration of the rite. A drop or two of water, sprinkled casually towards the child, is considered sufficient. So too with the service of the Communion. . . . The manner of celebrating it is significant. The minister stands at the north end of the Table . . . robed in surplice and scarf. There are no candles used, since these savour of 'Popery,' unless absolutely required

¹ *Non-Catholic Denominations*, p. 60.

for the purpose of giving light ; there is generally no cross upon the Table, an alms-dish occasionally takes its place. (In the Irish Church the cross is categorically forbidden.) The service is then read over by one or more ministers, who divide, if necessary, the words between them ; and the bread and wine are distributed. . . . The distribution is made in such a manner that crumbs fall in all directions, as may be verified by a visit to any such church on the day following the celebration of the rites, and at the close of the service the fragments left on the paten, and the remainder of the wine in the cup, are usually dealt with by the church-verger. Anything resembling ablutions by the minister is avoided deliberately, as likely to encourage a superstitious belief in the objective sanctity of the consecrated elements. There is not in all this—or even in the custom common until the middle of the nineteenth century of throwing the fragments of the consecrated bread to the birds in the churchyard—the faintest intention of irreverence. . . . The bread, in the eyes of such persons, has no sanctity at all ; or whatever trace of sanctity it had has vanished with the fulfilment of the purpose for which it was used.¹

As if to make up for the extreme tenets of the Low Church, we have at the other end of the scale the equally extreme High Church Party—the Ritualists—called into being by the Oxford Movement. The appeal to Primitive Christianity was, they saw, indecisive ; the appeal to the living voice of the Bishops more so still ; there only remained, they thought, an appeal to the Articles and Prayer Book interpreted, as the history of the foundation of the Anglican Church shows they should be, in a Catholic sense. For three centuries a Protestant explanation had been given of doubtful passages ; that did not alter the fact that a Catholic meaning was the more correct. Such Articles, therefore, as the twenty-second (on the Invocation of Saints), or the twenty-eighth (on Transubstantiation), or the thirty-first (on Masses), should be taken as condemning, not the dogmas themselves, but the popular errors in their regard fostered by the extreme 'Romanizers.' By a certain section of the party—the most extreme of all—even this form of

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 64, 65.

appeal to the Prayer Book has, within comparatively recent times, come to be regarded as insufficient. The Prayer Book, they say, is not a living voice : we appeal, therefore, to the unanimous teaching of the three great bodies into which the Catholic Church has now unfortunately been divided, the Roman, the Eastern, and the Anglican. When these three agree, even though it be only to the extent of refusing in one case to condemn what the others explicitly affirm, the doctrine is one of Catholic faith ; when they disagree, the rival doctrines may be true or false, but are, at all events, unessential. On the strength of this canon of criticism, the doctrines of the Real Presence, the Mass, Penance, Purgatory, etc., are found to belong to the Catholic deposit ; those of Infallibility, Indulgences, etc., are matters of private opinion. The party deplors the Reformation and all its consequences ; but, since God permitted the separation, for a time, of the component sections of the Catholic Church, it is the duty of every faithful Anglican to stand firm by the Church of his birth until all prejudice is removed and a general reconciliation possible. Whether the Anglican should frequent Catholic devotions in England the leaders are not agreed ; and all the time they shut their eyes to the unpleasant fact that however the three Churches may disagree in other matters they are quite unanimous in rejecting the proposed rule of faith : that the whole theory, therefore, even on their own principles, becomes not merely a doubtful but an absolutely untenable hypothesis.

These controversies among sections all professing to belong to one Established Church, and claiming to represent its doctrine accurately, prepare the way for the Broad Churchman—the Probabilist, we might call him, of Anglican dogma. Since on several doctrines the professed exponents are unable to agree, there is clearly, he says, no obligation to accept them at all. Though individuals have their views the Church herself has none, and really the most loyal and respectful thing to do is to follow her example. He has no belief whatever in the old Protestant principle of Justification by Faith ; he is inclined rather to go to the other extreme and made conduct the test of truth. If the

dogmas of Penance, the Resurrection, or the Real Presence are calculated to improve the lives of those who accept them, they are true and solidly based, or should at all events be regarded as such. The Sacraments are historically interesting, and have a real ethical value for those to whose emotional disposition they appeal, but there is no reason for regarding them as essential nor the commands regarding them as binding on all. God's Revelation was not complete at the death of His chosen Apostles. It goes hand in hand with science, and new light is being daily thrown on the contents and meaning of the Christian creed.

As will be seen from even this brief summary, the rival sections of the Anglican communion exhibit as great a divergence of dogma as can be well conceived in a community claiming to be founded on a Christian basis. The same cannot be said of the Presbyterian Church. Founded by Calvin in Geneva in the year 1541, it was established in Scotland in a modified form by the apostate priest, John Knox, in 1560, and, in the Geneva form, under the influence of Andrew Melville, in 1592. From that time to the present it has remained the national Church of Scotland. Through historical causes it has been broken up into various sections—the Established Church, the Original Seceders, the United Free Church, the Free Church, and the Free Presbyterians—but the differences in dogma are of comparatively trifling importance. If any distinction be drawn, it is found in the fact that the 'United Free' exhibits a greater activity than any of its rivals, and is more readily prepared to adopt the recent developments of critical research.

The leading principle of all, as their name implies, is that there is only one order of ministers in the Christian Church, that of Presbyters or Elders. They reject the principle of Episcopal government, their opposition to 'prelacy' being in fact, as history shows, only slightly less virulent than their rejection of Catholic claims. Though the minister is treated with great respect, and his historical descent through the Presbytery safeguarded, they recognize no sacrament of Orders nor any necessity for an Apostolic succession. In other matters their position is practically

that of the Low Church. Their belief in the fundamental dogmas is rigidly orthodox, but their acceptance of Justification by Faith, with its various stages (conversion, regeneration, and sanctification), excludes belief in the sacramental system. Penance they entirely reject, except in the sense of exclusion from Church membership; their Communion service has all the characteristic features already described in connexion with the Low Church; they have no Confirmation nor Extreme Unction, and the Baptism they confer has, in their view, no sacramental efficacy. The Church is the congregation of individuals throughout the world that profess the true religion, and, though Catholics are excluded by reason of their blasphemous doctrine, Anglicans are readily admitted. The Bible alone is the ultimate court of appeal, but a check is placed on private judgment by the universal acceptance of the Westminster Confession, and by the decisions of the Church Courts which form a prominent feature of Presbyterian life. The system, based originally on Calvinism, tends to represent the relations of God to His creatures as legal rather than paternal—'there is a certain appearance of grudgingness and severe justice even upon the face of God's mercy'—but it is, at the same time, a precise and definite system, and tends to develop in the more level-headed of those who adopt it a strong self-reliant type of character.

The separation of England from the Catholic Church, and the setting up of an authority to which Christ had given no special commission, was followed by its natural result. If the world is composed of various nations, so is the nation of various groups, and so is each group of separate individuals. The founders of the new religion could, therefore, offer no logical objection, though they did apply the rigour of the law, when separate groups arose asserting the same right to manage their own religious affairs as the heads of the Anglican Church claimed for the nation as a whole. Even in the time of Henry the cleavage appeared. The Anabaptists, or Re-Baptizers, insisting on the need of personal holiness and active co-operation with grace, applied their principles to the sacrament of Baptism, from which

they derive their name, and logically refused it to infants who could have no personal dispositions whatever. Their principle had been in operation for some time previously, but it is only in the year 1534 that their existence as a sect in England can be first distinctly traced. They cast aside much of what the Anglican Church retained; paid little attention to ceremonies except, again, those connected with Baptism; assumed a strong dogmatic attitude on the Divinity of Christ and the Atonement, and, notwithstanding bitter opposition from the civil power, preached their tenets to such effect that at the present time, under the name of Baptists, they claim the allegiance of six million subjects in England and elsewhere.

Next, in the reign of Elizabeth, came the Independents, from whom the Congregationalists of the present day are legitimately descended. The sect was founded, as far as we can judge from the records, by Robert Browne, who was summoned to answer for his conduct before the High Commission Court in 1571, and before the Ecclesiastical Commissioners ten years later; but it was only in the year 1616 that the 'First Independent or Congregationalist Church in England' was established at Blackfriars, in London, by Henry Jacob, a Kentish clergyman. They denounced sacerdotalism in all shapes and forms, and minimized the importance of the two sacraments they retained. Their fundamental principle was, and is, that every congregation is a Church, and that no external body has the slightest claim to interfere in the management of its affairs.

The 'Quakers,' or 'Society of Friends,' founded about 1650 by George Fox, assisted by James Naylor and Richard Farnworth, went further still. The baptism of the spirit is the only one they believe in, and every meal partaken of with due reverence is a real 'Lord's Supper,' as far as Christ desired there should be such a celebration at all. They hold pronounced views on war, self-defence, non-resistance, etc., but at their meetings they often preach no doctrine and pray no prayers, all waiting silently for the 'Illumination of the Spirit' with that inward 'quaking and trembling' from which they derive their more popular title. They have, all

through their history, been remarkable for works of practical benevolence, and their great ideal seems to be to live a quiet peaceful life, interfering with the conscience of nobody and claiming a similar indulgence themselves.

Among the later results of the legitimate application of illegitimate reform principles we may class the 'Methodists' and the 'Salvation Army.' The former—now divided into the 'Wesleyan,' the 'Primitive,' the 'Calvinistic,' the 'New Connexion,' and the 'United' Methodists—took their rise from the religious activity of John Wesley, though his intention was not to form a new sect but to foster a higher degree of spirituality than the Established Church of the time exhibited. When he founded his confraternity in 1727 he wished it to be known as the 'United Society,' but the name 'Methodist,' given in banter to a smaller brotherhood he had formed in Oxford some years earlier, appealed more to the popular taste, and was soon accepted by the body itself. The history of its gradual severance from the Established Church through the building of special preaching-houses, the appointment of lay-teachers, the ordination of Dr. Coke by Wesley himself, and the authorization of the use of the Book of Common Prayer by the preachers, forms in itself an interesting study. In regard to 'methods' of promoting spirituality, they have ideas of their own, but in doctrinal matters they differ little from the other Independent sects we have enumerated.

The Salvation Army, founded by Mr. Booth in 1865, should be regarded not as a sect so much as a guild or religious order. It allows its members to participate in the religious services of the various denominations, but has very little ritual of its own. It believes in instantaneous conversion, has a magnificent organization comprising some 16,000 officers and controlling a yearly income of one and a half million pounds, and devotes itself with great energy and remarkable success to the improvement of the social condition of the poor and suffering.

The term 'Nonconformist' was originally applied to the non-episcopal ministers driven from their benefices by the Restoration Parliament, but in popular language at

present all the sects mentioned—outside the Established Churches—are comprised under the title. Notwithstanding that their existence is ultimately due to a desire for individual expression, their social instincts have begun to reassert themselves, and a marked desire for re-union has made itself manifest for years past. The first 'National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches,' claiming to represent a laity of over sixty millions but with no pretence to jurisdiction, was held at Nottingham in 1896, and a yearly congress has been held regularly since. One of the first results was the drawing up of a 'Free Church Catechism,' which, if we make allowance for vague phraseology that may easily conceal a wide divergence of doctrinal view, represents, with a fair amount of accuracy, the general Nonconformist teaching. Two sacraments are acknowledged, and the dogmas of the Real Presence and Baptismal regeneration, though not necessitated, are certainly suggested by the formulæ employed. Justification by Faith, if held, is at all events not emphasized. The Church is defined to be the Society of Believers in Christ, and the doctrine of a Universal Church, so long buried, would seem to be coming to the surface again. But, whatever the theory, it must be confessed that it is almost impossible to find in Nonconformist practice any well-defined trace of Catholic dogma, beyond the fundamental truths that all bodies with even no claim to the Christian name must admit. The Nonconformist and the Low Churchman are, doctrinally, very much on the same plane. In the chapels the worshippers do not kneel, the pulpit and the preacher are the central points in the service, water and other liquids are freely used for the Communion whenever a protest is made in the name of temperance, and nothing is more common than to find the religious devotions replaced by a purely political discussion. In fact, the social life of Nonconformity, of which the chapel is the centre, is the main attraction for the ordinary member. The layman is allowed to occupy the pulpit in the minister's place and address the meeting on his favourite topic ; and the ' Mothers' Meetings,' ' Sunday Schools,' and ' Pleasant Sunday After-

noons' appeal to many on whom the prospect of an ordinary spiritual lecture would have very little influence.

The right of each congregation to act as an independent body and settle its own faith and discipline, forms, it will be remembered, one of the cardinal points in the Congregationalist teaching. We need, therefore, feel no surprise that it is within the borders of this particular sect that the 'New Theology' has been allowed to grow up practically unchecked. Its chief expositor—the Rev. R. J. Campbell, of the City Temple—claims that his system preserves the essence of the Christian faith. If the claim be true, the essence of the Christian faith must be something very different from what the whole Christian world has hitherto supposed. The New Theology is based on a Pantheistic conception of the universe. Every motion of matter or spirit, every mode of energy, is really divine; sin and vice, in the ordinarily accepted sense, have no existence. Man is the highest product of the Divine energy, and Revelation nothing more than his gradually deepening insight into the general scheme of things. Among men Christ occupies a foremost place as *the* Son of Man, and, therefore, *the* Son of God, but He is no more essentially divine than any other human being, nor was His Atonement different, except perhaps in degree, from that of every good man who teaches the world the truth and suffers persecution for the sake of justice. His virgin Birth and Resurrection are myths, and the Sacraments He is supposed to have established nothing more than 'a picturesque incentive to noble conduct,' 'dramatic appeals to the finer and nobler emotions of man.' Miracles are utterly impossible, the supernatural non-existent, Hell merely a relic of antiquated thought. The world, older to-day than it ever was, is wiser also. The most recent expounder of scientific ethical criticism is quite within his rights in rejecting the conclusions of the highest authorities of earlier times, and in correcting the ill-formed views and imperfect outlook on life represented in the teaching of Christ and the Apostles.

All these sects are brought before us by Father Benson in the little volume we have mentioned. And many more.

The aristocratic Episcopalian Church of Scotland; the 'Irvingites,' with their 'angels' and 'prophets' and special revelations; the 'Theosophists,' with their *Karma* and their astral plane; the 'Christian Scientists' and the 'Mind-Healers,' with their exaggerated ideas of the power of mind over matter, and their absurd incursions into the field of Christian dogma; the 'Plymouth Brethren,' that started with the idea of uniting all sects and only succeeded in forming another; the Unitarians, denying the central dogma of Christianity—all these are sketched in a bright and vivid manner that excites the reader's interest and rivets his attention. But the list, it need hardly be said, is not exhaustive. We are spared—and it is perhaps as well—a detailed account of the Jumpers, the Muggletonians, the Burghers, the Antiburghers, the Old Light Burghers, the New Light Burghers, the Old Light Antiburghers, the New Light Antiburghers, the Sweet Singers, the Pentecostal Dancers, and the other almost countless sections generated by the whimsical fancies of Protestant fanaticism.

As we lay aside the book our predominating feeling is one of sympathy. A nation cannot with impunity cut itself off from the accumulated religious experience of sixteen centuries. The sects are falling victims to abuses that the Catholic Church of more than a thousand years ago had learned to control, and new guilds are being started with a fanatical zeal for principles of which, in their proper place and in due moderation, she has long since taken account. And recognizing as we do the depth of faith and genuine spirituality that underlies the conflicts of the various bodies, we find additional grounds for hope that they may one day return to the Church of Christ, and find the rest and peace they have sought for in vain for the last three hundred years.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

THE 'SCAPULAR PROMISE' FROM THE HISTORICAL STANDPOINT

IN a recent number of the I. E. RECORD, special attention was drawn to the Indult empowering the Congregation of Rites to grant faculties to Bishops, superiors-general, and priests 'to bless and endow medals with the privileges and indulgences hitherto associated with scapulars.'¹ The question as to how the new legislation may affect the Scapular of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, because of the well-known promise attaching to the wearing of the same, was left in abeyance 'until the matter is placed beyond doubt by some authentic pronouncement.' Meanwhile, the editor kindly allows me to avail myself of the present opportunity to fulfil a promise given to his readers on a former occasion when referring casually to the recognized official sources of reliable information concerning the vision vouchsafed to St. Simon Stock.²

At first sight the task does not appear to present any great difficulty, but I then expressly stated that these sources, as quite distinct from the authority usually quoted by other writers, had not yet been so much as mentioned in certain articles published in the I. E. RECORD a few years ago.³ Readers will remember that in those contributions much was said about a particular document upon the authenticity of which arguments in favour of the historical truth of the promise almost exclusively depended; to be refuted, however, with apparent ease, in a critical article written in reply.⁴ Personally, I cannot say that the method adopted by either of the writers appealed to me as being of a kind to test adequately the

¹ I. E. RECORD, December, 1910. Reference is made to the Sabbatine Privilege further on.

² Ibid., January, 1911, p. 31.

³ Ibid., May, 1901, p. 385; February, March, and April, 1904, pp. 142, 206, 331.

⁴ Ibid., July, 1904, p. 59.

evidential value of so important a document, purporting to be a verified copy of an ancient MS. discovered at Bordeaux in the course of the seventeenth century, and which again disappeared in such circumstances as to arouse the suspicions of those 'somewhat sceptically disposed.' I did not find it very reassuring to notice that manifest mistakes made in connexion with this document, by one of the two writers concerned, were described by the other as a 'hopeless muddle,' and attributed to the Carmelites of the fourteenth century—'of the time in fact when the legend originated!'¹

However, the original MS. being no longer available for scientific examination, I have undertaken to demonstrate from the positive evidence of other medieval documents still extant the historical truth of the 'Scapular Vision'; and I will ask the reader to bear in mind the essential points of the narrative found in the tomb of St. Simon Stock at Bordeaux by Father John Chéron, who testified to its having been written by Peter Swanynghon, the contemporary and intimate friend of the saint:—

Cum effunderem animam meam in conspectu Domini . . . et in omni fiducia Dominam meam Virginem Mariam deprecarer, quod sicut volebat nos appellari Fratres suos, monstraret se matrem, eripiendo nos de casu tentationum, et aliquo signo gratiae nos recommendando erga ipsos qui nos persequerentur, dicendo illi cum suspiriis: Flos Carmeli, Vitis florifera, Splendor coeli, Virgo puerpera singularis; Mater mitis, sed viri nescia, Carmelitis da privilegia, Stella maris: apparuit mihi cum grandi comitatu, et tenendo habitum Ordinis dixit: 'Hoc erit tibi et cunctis Carmelitis privilegium. In hoc moriens aeternum non patietur incendium.' Et . . . disparendo dixit, quod mitterem ad dominum Innocentium, benedicti Filii sui Vicarium, qui de gravaminibus remedium praestaret. . . . Idem verbum [continues Swanynghon] mittebat ad fratres qui erant in aliis locis valde tristes, per consolatoriam, quam ego immeritus, homine Dei dicente, scribebam, ut similiter gratias agerent, orando et perseverando. Cantabrigiae in crastinum Divisionis Apostolorum, 1251.²

¹ I. E. RECORD, July, 1904, p. 65.

² *Speculum Carmelitanum*, i., 518; *Vinea Carmeli*, p. 439.

Here, at least, we have the principal details of the Scapular Vision as accepted by the Carmelites of the seventeenth century; and these they submitted with the utmost confidence when exhorting the faithful to filial reliance on the truth of our Lady's wondrous promise:—

(a) Down to the year 1251 the White Friars, in England especially, suffered grievous hardships.

(b) So oppressive had their trials become at that date, the Prior-General of the Order, St. Simon Stock, could only implore the Blessed Virgin, as chief patroness of the Carmelites, to intervene miraculously, granting some special sign of her powerful protection.

(c) Our Lady appeared to him and gave the habit of the Order as the desired pledge: attaching thenceforth to the wearing of it a most consoling promise; and instructing St. Simon to appeal forthwith to Pope Innocent IV. for succour against their oppressors.

(d) The saint took immediate steps to have so great a favour made known to the religious generally; and a striking miracle, wrought at Winchester, is associated with the ensuing popularity of the White Friars throughout England. This is recorded by Swanyngton as a subsequent event; but I thought it well to include everything of distinct importance, in order that the critical reader may judge for himself as to whether Father John Chéron could be fairly accused in this wise: 'Having come across some sort of account a century or more older than his time, he chose to assume that it was a contemporary narrative, attributed it to Swanyngton, and manipulated it' accordingly.¹

Seeing that it is now my purpose to establish these points quite independently of the narrative of Peter Swanyngton, and even of the authorities quoted in his *Collections*² by John Bale; of course those who would still maintain a sceptical attitude towards the Scapular Vision must be prepared to explain upon what rational grounds they could

¹ I. E. RECORD, July, 1904, p. 64.

² MS. Harley, 3838.

reject such *historical* facts as I am about to submit for genuinely critical investigation; for these facts are so recorded by the respective writers, whom I shall consult in contemporary MS. copies of their works, as to convey the impression of absolute certainty; and it would be simply impossible to think of fraud or credulity in conjunction with their names. As for the source of *their* information, there can be but one opinion; but it might seem too like 'begging the question' were I to insist upon it at this stage.¹

As 'an eye-witness' of the events which he himself describes, a prominent place is due to the evidence of William de Sanvico, who furnishes a vivid narrative of the expulsion of his brethren from the Holy Land, A.D. 1238-1241, and of the troubles that awaited them in Europe. A seventeenth-century version of this most important narrative was mentioned by a former contributor to the I. E. RECORD when treating of the 'Scapular Promise'; but nothing was said of the ancient MS. copies of the treatise known to be in existence.² However, it is not my wish to complain of this omission; but I must draw attention to the painfully laboured effort then made to convict de Sanvico of historical inaccuracy, because the particular date which he assigns did not happen to bear out rather a bewildering surmise on the part of the contributor to whom I refer: that the Scapular Vision really occurred just ten years later than the time specified by Peter Swanyngton. (Whence the 'hopeless muddle' in chronology ascribed to the medieval Carmelites!)³ In a subsequent article it was admitted that de Sanvico had given the correct date after all; that it had been verified at some official source of information.⁴ Freely confessing my own inability to

¹ But I shall have occasion to allude to the matter again. In the meantime I may refer the reader to the *Speculum Carmelitanum*, t. ii. n. 1478, p. 413. Indeed, a detailed vindication of Father John Chéron's memory suggests the theme for a special and particularly interesting article.

² I. E. RECORD, May, 1901, p. 385, n. 2.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 404.

⁴ *Ibid.*, February, 1904, p. 152.

follow the argument designed to show that this only confirmed the plausibleness of the surmise in question, I will here quote the passage as occurring in the version of de Sanvico's narrative issued A.D. 1370; and it is now taken from a contemporary transcript¹ :—

Videntes ergo fratres quod super praemissis [hardships] non poterant cum praelatis favorem invenire, Virginem Mariam eorum patronam humiliter deprecabantur, ut quae ipsos ad regiones illas pervenire fecerat a praemissis diabolicis tentationibus eos eriperet. Virgo itaque Maria priori eorum revelavit ut ad summum pontificem Innocentium intrepide fratres sui accederent; quia ab eo salubre remedium contra praemissa gravamina reportarent. Ad ipsum ergo tunc Perusii comorantem accedentes, fratres ipsi exposuerunt gravamina quae curati eis inferebant, et favorem modicum quem super praemissis praelati eis impendebant. Pontifex autem praedictis fratribus compatiens scripsit praelatis Idibus Januarii, A.D. 1252, mandans eis ut super praemissis pium favorem fratribus impenderent et molestatores eorum per censuram ecclesiasticam appellatione postposita compescerent. . . . Sicque paulatim hanc religionem in diversis fidelium regionibus per Europam multiplicabant.²

Now, it must be borne in mind that William de Sanvico was himself a member of the Order at the very date mentioned in his narration. His object in writing was to leave a formal record of the circumstances in which his brethren in religion had been expelled from the Holy Land (A.D. 1238-1241), and as to how their presence was actively resented in Europe—in England principally—until the intervention of Pope Innocent IV. on their behalf. To my mind this passing allusion to our Lady's apparition to St. Simon Stock—the then Prior-General of the Order—is proof positive of the fact of that supernatural favour being already thoroughly well known, not only to the Carmelites themselves, but to the faithful generally, when de Sanvico wrote his relation; and, remembering the purpose which he had in view, I should unhesitatingly

¹ MS. A. 9, 241.—I. E. RECORD, January, 1911, p. 44.

² In a former chapter (iii.) de Sanvico makes express mention of the Carmelites in England.

pronounce any more detailed account of such an event as being entirely out of place in a narrative of this kind.¹ Nevertheless, even from this casual reference we learn:—

(a) At a specified date the Carmelites were enduring certain grave trials.

(b) It was then their Prior-General had a vision, during which he received particular instructions from the Blessed Virgin for the encouragement and consolation of the religious.

(c) Because of these instructions the Carmelites laid their case before Pope Innocent IV.—to receive immediate succour at the hands of that Pontiff (A.D. 1252).

(d) The prosperity of the Order in Europe (and especially in England) followed gradually, apparently as a matter of course . . . It would be superfluous to invite comparison of these facts with those recounted in connexion with the selfsame event by Peter Swanyngton.

No one could dream of questioning the importance of de Sanvico's testimony as to the fact of St. Simon Stock having been favoured by a vision from the Blessed Virgin at a trying juncture in the history of the Carmelite Order; for his evidence is confirmed by the Bull of Pope Innocent IV. issued on that occasion, and for the very purpose assigned.² But we have just seen that were it not for this corroboration, de Sanvico's veracity as a witness would stand seriously impugned in the opinion of some recent writers; because of his having so emphatically stated that the opposition to his brethren in Europe had begun to wane from the year 1252. I am not aware of any effort having hitherto been made to show that even independently of the Bull of Pope Innocent IV. the authenticity of the narrative, in this respect, might be easily vindicated from other contemporary sources. Take, for example, the

¹ This narrative was written in the latter half of the thirteenth century; but the exact year is not known, the annalists submitting various dates as probable, still merely conjectural.

² In the I. E. RECORD, February, 1904, p. 152, this Bull is cited as 'No. 5,563, in' Elie Berger's edition' of the Register of Pope Innocent IV. I prefer to quote from the transcript given in the version of de Sanvico's narrative, issued A.D. 1370, MS. A. 9, 241.

English *State Papers* of that period. It is surely significant that prior to the same year (1252) we meet with no mention from which we could infer that the Order had made the least material progress in the country; although it is quite certain that isolated communities of the Hermits of Carmel had settled in England since A.D. 1212, when their austere mode of life was embraced by St. Simon Stock; while we have de Sanvico's own assurance of their number being considerably augmented there after the year 1238.¹ I do not forget that these facts clash with the conjectures of critics who rely solely on the authority of John Bale for their information concerning the history of the Carmelites; and indeed I have wondered how they would manage to reconcile their very dogmatic assertions on the subject with what Bale himself states so positively: that he had seen and examined an ancient MS. clearly demonstrating the fact of the growing fame of the Carmelites throughout Europe as early as the year 1220.² I may add, incidentally, that John de Horneby—who successfully upheld the claims of his Order at Cambridge—produced conclusive evidence to show that these religious had already been established in Cyprus long before the end of the twelfth century.³

However, the prospects of the English White Friars became much brighter, undoubtedly, from the date mentioned by de Sanvico; for preserved among the Patent Rolls of King Henry III. we still have the official record of their having secured the royal protection (for the first time, so far as I can ascertain), A.D. 1252, the 'Letters' granting the same being 'sine termino cum hac clausula: Et rogamus quod cum ad vos venerint elemosinas petitori, eis de bonis vestris misericorditer erogetis.'⁴ In the circumstances I do not think that even the most exacting critic would venture to brush aside the issue of this patent as a mere 'striking coincidence': that it admits of an inter-

¹ Cambridge MS. (University Library), Ff. 6, 11, f. 42.

² *Scriptores Britanniae*, vol. i. p. 260; *ibid.*, p. 269.

³ MS. Bodley, e Mus. 86, f. 212b.

⁴ Patent Roll 37, Henry III., m. 21, Public Record Office, London.

pretation different from the one which I claim it bears, marking a most desirable change in the condition of the Carmelites in England immediately after our Lady's vision to St. Simon Stock. William de Sanvico piously traces the intervention of Pope Innocent IV. on that occasion to a supernatural favour; to what are we to attribute the very opportune mediation of King Henry III.?

But the inaugurator of hostile criticism of the Scapular Devotion in the seventeenth century—the 'famous and somewhat sceptical French scholar, J. Launoy,' to quote from an article in the I. E. RECORD¹—denied that this vision was to be associated with any such promise as that insisted upon by Father John Chéron and other contemporary Carmelites.² Moreover, if there had been a promise of this kind de Sanvico had here an excellent opportunity of mentioning so extraordinary a privilege: 'Loquendi tamen locum fuisse vel opportunissimum, quis negaret?' Certain writers of the present day consider the same question equally pertinent, citing the omission as a forcible argument based on the 'negative evidence of history'! Besides, being in the Holy Land at the time, de Sanvico could only have acquired his information at 'second-hand,' so to speak, from those religious of the English province whom he may have met, later on, at some general chapter of the Order—sufficiently reliable witnesses, I should have thought; if I may not refer to the consoling tidings conveyed to the Carmelites generally by Peter Swanyngton, acting on the express injunction received from St. Simon Stock.

It was Launoy's taunt that he could find no authoritative pronouncement on the question—the testimony of some one who in virtue of his official capacity had so spoken about the origin of the Scapular Promise as to remove every vestige of doubt concerning its authenticity from the strictly historical point of view. As for Father John Chéron's discovery, it has been stated that 'the

¹ July, 1904, p. 62.

² Joannis Launoyi. *Dissertationes V., De Simonis Stochii Viso, etc.*, ed. iii. Paris, 1663, p. 12. I do not think that his other treatise on the Scapular, *Examen du Privilège d'Alexandre V.*, etc., has yet been removed from the Index.

appearance of this *deus ex machina* was hailed by him and others with ill-concealed derision'; but our informant apparently forgot to add how Launoy treats the evidence furnished by a very renowned Prior-General of the Carmelite Order, already distinguished among his contemporaries A.D. 1370—the date of that version of de Sanvico's narrative from which I have quoted; and little more than one hundred years after the death of St. Simon Stock.¹ The famous French scholar openly jeers at this evidence: first declaring and *trying* to prove that the witness was not trustworthy; but subsequently modifying this opinion, as he felt satisfied that the record in question had been forged by the Carmelites after the witness's death.² It so happens that I myself am in a position to show how very much mistaken Launoy was in this respect, at least.

The Prior-General referred to was Father John Grossi, destined to render services of incalculable worth to Christendom by his successful efforts to end the Great Western Schism—one of the most trying crises in the whole history of the Church. He was Superior-General of one of the two sections of the Order in the year 1389; and although now of advanced age, he found himself unanimously elected Prior-General of all the Carmelites in a Chapter specially convened, A.D. 1411, after the long, sad estrangement between the religious acknowledging the authority of Pope Urban VI. and his successors, and those who had proclaimed themselves 'Clementines.' It was mainly through Grossi's instrumentality that the blessings of peace and union had been restored to the Order—a happy augury of what should happen at the Council of Constance later on. Furthermore, in order to insure the permanency of this revival of monastic fervour in his own Order, Grossi wrote the well-known *Viridarium* for the instruction and edification of the religious.³ It was his object to illustrate

¹ I. E. RECORD, July, 1904, p. 62.

² Launoy, *De Simonis Stockii Viso*, p. 16; *ibid.* p. 39, et *passim*.

³ I have come across several medieval MS. copies of this most important work, but circumstances did not admit of my examining them very closely, had I then occasion to do so. Fortunately, in view of recent events, there is an admirable copy preserved in the Bodleian Library (MS. Laud. Misc. 722, f. 113), which I am utilizing for my present purpose.

the ideal of the true Carmelite's life by the examples of certain saints of the Order who had attained to pre-eminent holiness simply by the observance of a Rule that contained an epitome of the traditions handed down to them from the days of the Prophet Elias.¹ Amongst others was St. Simon Stock, who obtained for them so great a privilege at the hands of the Blessed Virgin, in virtue of those selfsame traditions, appealing to her on behalf of his brethren then sorely tried throughout Europe. But Grossi takes it for granted, manifestly, that all members of the Order would be well aware of the event to which he thus briefly refers, dwelling, however, on certain details of the vision that supplement the incidental allusion made to the same extraordinary favour by William de Sanvico.

He knew that he could further the purpose which he had in mind when writing the *Viridarium* by speaking of his own recent experience in England, where he had witnessed some of the marvellous results of our Lady's promise; and in doing so he has left a reliable account of the actual sense in which the Scapular Devotion was understood by the faithful generally within Grossi's own memory, which, as we shall now see, brings us very close to the time of St. Simon Stock.²

Remembering the responsible position held in the Order by John Grossi A.D. 1389, surely it is not too much to assume that he had then attained the fiftieth year of his age? Otherwise, how could he himself have so pathetically pleaded the 'burden of years' in order to be relieved of the office of Prior-General long before the death of one of his most enthusiastic admirers amongst the English White Friars, the celebrated Thomas Walden, who died in 1430?³ At all events, we have positive evidence to

¹ I. E. RECORD, January, 1911, p. 41.

² It is not pleasant to have to say that the evidential value of Grossi's testimony has been so represented recently as to obscure completely the importance of its bearing on the authenticity of the Scapular Promise, recalling, in fact, Launoy's uncritical comments.

³ MS. Harley, 3838, f. 82b; MS. Bodley, 73, f. 98.

show that certain Carmelites who had been professed in the Order before the death of St. Simon Stock were still living A.D. 1338, which merely implies, after all, that these religious had now reached their ninetieth year—by no means a wonderful age.¹ Consequently, had there ever been the slightest misgiving about the exact interpretation of the Scapular Promise, many of John Grossi's own contemporaries could testify to what they themselves had heard from the lips of those venerable men concerning so remarkable an event in the history of the Order.

However, there is nothing in the *Viridarium* to lead us to infer that this was how Grossi verified the facts which he records with such absolute conviction of their authenticity. Hence, I submit that he had access to some source of reliable information, intimately known to himself and his coevals, including the renowned Walden: some such letter, for instance, as that to which reference is made in the MS. discovered by Father John Chéron at Bordeaux. Of course those who rely on the authority of the somewhat sceptical Launoy will not be prepared to admit the reasonableness of this conjecture, since the famous French scholar bluntly accuses the Carmelites of a subsequent age of having 'manipulated' the *Viridarium* after the death of both Walden and Grossi: 'nec tunc immerito dicetur, eam [the fame of the Scapular Vision] assutam esse ab iis, qui post Waldensis obitum Swaingtoni historiam, et Grossi *Viridarium* transcripserunt.'² So sure was Launoy that the silence of Thomas Walden (erroneously assumed) argued this atrocious fraud, he bases upon it his chief argument against the veracity of the Scapular Promise: 'Hoc, iterum dico, prae ceteris argumentum me convincit.'³ But we have seen that Walden did not die until the year 1430, whereas the aged Grossi survived until A.D. 1434. Now, the copy of the *Viridarium* preserved in the Bodleian Library dates from

¹ MS. Selden, supra, 41, 4, cap. x.; also *Speculum Ordinis*, ed. 1507. De Hildesheim's treatise.

² *De Simonis Stockii Viso*, p. 16.

³ *Ibid.*

the year 1426, and from it the following passage has been transcribed¹ :—

Saepius vero Virginem gloriosam Dei Genitricem patronam Ordinis deprecabatur (St. Simon) ut suo titulo insignitos comuniret privilegio. . . . Sic demum Beata Virgo cum multitudine angelorum beato viro apparuit Scapulare Ordinis in manibus suis tenens et dicens: 'Hoc erit tibi et cunctis Carmelitis privilegium in hoc moriens salvabitur.' Ratione hujus magni privilegii diversi proceres regni Angliae, utpote dictus Edwardus Rex Angliae Secundus post Conquestum, qui fratres praedictos fundavit Oxoniis dans illis proprium palatium pro conventu, Dominus Henricus dux Lancastriae primus, qui miraculis multis dicitur claruisse, et multi alii nobiles hujus regni praedicti Scapulare Ordinis in vita clandestine portaverunt in quo postea obierunt.²

This testimony—and nothing could be more explicit—simply amounts to a statement of well-known facts, even including reference to the popularity of the Scapular Devotion in England; for the religious generally would have been aware that Grossi had visited that country in his official capacity, a fact formally attested to by the Royal Letters of Protection granted to him on that occasion, and which we find recorded on the Patent Rolls of the period, A.D. 1412.³ So we are assured, on reliable authority, once more :—

(a) That St. Simon Stock had occasion to implore our Lady's miraculous intervention during some crisis in the history of the Carmelite Order.

(b) That the Blessed Virgin appeared to him, and gave the Scapular of his Order as a sign of her special protection, attaching a promise to the wearing of the same.

(c) That all the faithful might participate in this promise,

¹ MS. Laud. Misc. 722, fol. 113. In calce, 'Explicit origo cum vita de sanctis fratribus Ordinis Beatae Mariae Dei Genitricis de Monte Carmeli. Anno Domini, Mo.CCCC.XXVIo.' Conf. 'Viridarii, Pars Secunda,' in the *Speculum Carmelitanum* (Antwerp, A.D. 1680), t. i. pars ii. p. 139.

² MS. Laud. Misc. 722, fol. 114b.

³ Patent Roll, 14 Henry IV., m. 10. This is a most important and interesting document, and is preserved in the Public Record Office, London.

and many began to wear the Scapular of the Carmelites *secretly*.

(d) That it was in virtue of this promise benefactors became so devoted to the Order, particularly in England.

Here the critical student of the question may well ask himself: In face of this evidence how could Father John Chéron have been accused of 'manipulating' the MS. found in the tomb of St. Simon Stock at Bordeaux? He, at least, knew that Grossi's *Viridarium* had been written and transcribed before the death of Thomas Walden, during whose life, according to the sceptic Launoy, the White Friars would not have dared to exploit such a fraud!

Seeing, therefore, that the influence of the famous French scholar extends to our own times, and that Launoy challenged his readers to search the works of Walden for confirmation of the Scapular Promise, it may prove instructive if I dwell a little longer on this aspect of the case, since I am by no means inclined to admit Walden's silence on the subject; in fact, he was the very first to furnish a most valuable clue to the solution of the only difficulty which I myself had experienced in connexion with the Scapular Devotion—the express reference made to the Carmelite habit in the book *On the Institution of the First Monks* and in the *Ancient Constitutions* of the Order. I do not forget the opinion of that modern German writer, quoted on a former occasion in the I. E. RECORD,¹ who believed that the Carmelites 'had no scapulars in the beginning of the Order'; but the following testimony is far more reliable, and has come down to us from the year 412:—

Superhumeralibus etiam prisci Religionis professores tempore legis veteris utebantur. . . . Erat autem superhumeralis vestis sine manicis, usque ad renes descendens, in utroque latere aperta, brachiis etiam ea nudatis, cujus posterior pars in humeris copulabatur parti anteriori. Novae autem legis tempore huic vesti in apertura colli junctum fuit capitium, tegens caput, et scapulas. Quam nostrae Religionis professores . . . usque

¹ July, 1904, p. 73, note 2.

nunc (A.D. 412) summa cum diligentia [diebus ac noctibus] indesinenter gestabant.¹

Furthermore, the reason why this particular garment (the scapular) should be worn constantly with such scrupulous care is immediately assigned by John of Jerusalem: because it denotes obedience—the basis of the monastic virtues. In the very next chapter (xlvi.) he explains the mystical meaning of the white mantle worn by the Carmelites from the beginning, and concerning which, likewise, some extraordinary statements have been made in the I. E. RECORD by writers unaware, or unmindful, of certain historical facts recorded by St. Cyril of Constantinople.² So, too, is it to the book *On the Institution of the First Monks* that we must trace that distinction between the scapular as *habitus professionis* and the white mantle as *signum religionis* to be found in the writings of the medieval Carmelite doctors, which has been entirely ignored by certain modern critics who prefer to rely on the authority of the seventeenth-century opponents of the Order.³

Turning to the most ancient copy of the Carmelite Constitutions to hand—those approved of at the General Chapter of the year 1324—this is what we read in the sixth Rubric ('De dormitione Fratrum'): 'Statuimus quod fratres in tunica et Scapulari dormiant supracincti, sub poena gravis culpae. Exceptis infirmis quorum relinquimus arbitrio ut Scapulare induant vel deponant.'⁴ But this, undoubtedly, is taken from the *Ancient Constitutions* of the Order quoted by the renowned Baconthorpe and several of his contemporaries, and which date from the days of

¹ I. E. RECORD, January, 1911, p. 39, note 1; MS. A. 9. 241; *ibid.* p. 44.

² *Ibid.*, July, 1904, p. 72; *conf. ibid.* January, 1911, p. 47; *Liber S. Cyrilli Constan.* cap. ii.

³ *Signum religionis* rather refers to the object for which the particular Order was founded, *ad venerationem Virginis Deiparae*, in the case of the Carmelites, as John Baconthorpe shows so clearly in his beautiful treatise on the subject. MS. Laud. Misc. 722, fol. 122. See I. E. RECORD, July, 1904, p. 72. But John de Horneby proves conclusively that it is not the mantle, *sed Scapulare (quod) est habitus professionis meae*.—MS. Bodley, e. Mus. 86, fol. 191b.

⁴ MS. Add. 16372, British Museum.

St. Brocard, who is said to have compiled them by drawing largely upon the book of the Patriarch John.¹

Hence my own difficulty to understand how this statute became affected by the promise attaching to the scapular from the time of St. Simon Stock until I came across the explanation in the *Doctrinale Fidei*, the best known of all Walden's works; for he instances this very Rubric against the Wyclifites, and in doing so elucidates the meaning: 'Nostri Carmelitae in tunica candida et Scapulari nocturno' [dormiunt].² This express mention of a special scapular for use during sleep reveals that even in Walden's time a custom prevailed in the Order to interpret the Rubric in a more rigorous sense; because what had formerly been worn, day and night, as the emblem of monastic obedience was now revered as the most appropriate sign chosen by the Blessed Virgin to be the vehicle of her reassuring promise. And no longer would the religious avail themselves of that clause (*exceptis infirmis*) which modified the ordinance in case of necessity. New legislation on the subject was introduced later on; but even at the present day the Constitutions of the Discalced Carmelites afford a good illustration of how the custom to which I allude became obligatory in the Order in the course of time: 'Fratres dum cubant, Scapulari parvo utantur . . . nullus sanus, vel aeger, suum habitum, hoc est Scapulare, exuat, sed aegrotantibus tenuius permittetur.'³

Having ventured to mention the difficulty suggested to my own mind in this connexion, I must take care not to leave the reader under the impression that there is anything conjectural about the solution thus derived from the *Doctrinale Fidei*. Nor could I demonstrate this more satisfactorily than by adducing the unimpeachable testimony of another of the famed Walden's contemporaries—the Venerable Thomas Bradley, chosen by Pope Eugene IV. to proceed to Rhodes as Apostolic Legate, and afterwards to bear the burden of the episcopate as Bishop of Dromore

¹ I. E. RECORD, January, 1911, p. 40.

² T. iii., col. 4, A, f. 139b.

³ Pars i. cap. x., *De Fratrum Indumentis*, nn. 17, 19.

in Ireland.¹ He had already acquired great renown throughout England while Walden himself was still Superior of the White Friars of that province; and his works include several most valuable treatises concerning the history of the Carmelite Order, in one of which the Scapular Promise is dealt with as follows:—

Cui (St. Simon Stock) Beatissima Virgo cum multitudine Angelorum apparuit, Scapulare, seu Cucullam antiqui Ordinis Carmelitarum cum parvo caputio usque ad cingulum descendens in benedictis manibus suis tenens, et dicens: Hoc erit tibi, et cunctis Carmelitis privilegium, quod in hoc moriens aeternum non patietur incendium, id est, in hoc moriens salvabitur, tradidit. Quod ipse Simon devote suscipiens caputium grossum de Scapulari seu cuculla sua deposuit, et caputium suum aliud juxta formam caputii, quod a B. Virgine receperat Scapulari addidit; quo etiam Scapulari tam ipse, quam omnes alii Carmelitae usque in hodiernum diem die nocteque pro habitu suae professionis utuntur.²

I may remark that, in this instance, Bradley was treating of the Carmelite habit in detail, and merely refers to the Scapular Vision in order to explain certain alterations which had been introduced by St. Simon Stock. He, too, speaks of the promise as of unquestionable authenticity, while in another place he mentions the 'Winchester miracle' when speaking of the monasteries founded for the White Friars in England: 'Wyntonyae fundator Dominus Petrus de Wyntonia Praepositus Ecclesiae Sanctae Helenae, Wyntoniensis: qui propter miraculum sibi per gloriosam Virginem Mariam ostensum, Fratres ibidem fundavit.'³

¹ In Ware's *Bishops* (Harris, Dublin, 1739), vol. i. p. 261 sqq., it is stated that Bishop Bradley succeeded to the See of Dromore, A.D. 1434, and resigned in 1440. But this is not borne out by the note in MS. Harley 211, fol. 191, which appears to have been written by Bradley himself: 'Orate pro anima Thomae Bradley quondam anachoreta in conventu Fratrum Carmelitarum Norwic. Et postea, A.D. 1448, factus est Episcopus Dromor. in Hibernia et Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Legatus.' Of course he may have been consecrated before the death of Pope Eugene IV. (A.D. 1447). *Conf. Dict. Nat. Biogr.*, vol. li. p. 147.

² *Conf. Speculum Carmelitanum*, vol. i. pt. ii. p. 192. Cambridge MS. Ff. 6, 11, f. 42.

³ See the *Speculum Carmelitanum*, vol. i. pt. ii. p. 184, which also contains an excellent summary of the Cambridge MS., University Library, Ff. 6, 11; *ibid.* pp. 190-194, et passim.

Moreover, he gives the identical words in which St. Simon was accustomed to address the Blessed Virgin, which are quoted by John Grossi, and which occur in the document discovered at least two hundred years later on at Bordeaux: 'Flos Carmeli, Vitis florigera, Splendor coeli, Virgo puerpera singularis, Mater mitis sed viri nescia, Carmelitis da privilegia, Stella maris.'¹ Therefore, according to the Venerable Bishop Bradley, Walden's contemporary:—

(a) St. Simon Stock found it necessary to have recourse to the Blessed Virgin, imploring her to grant some sign of special patronage to the Carmelites.

(b) Our Lady appeared to him holding the scapular (or *habit*) of the Order in her hands, and gave this as a sign, promising eternal salvation to those who should die wearing the same.

(c) The saint took practical steps to proclaim this great favour, altering the form of the scapulary as a permanent memorial of so marvellous a grace.

(d) From that time the Carmelite habit (or *scapular*) became invested with a new significance for the religious, being worn unremittingly by them with most sedulous care. Incidentally, Bishop Bradley alludes elsewhere to a miracle wrought at Winchester through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin, which had the effect of furthering the welfare of the White Friars in England.²

I do not know how Bishop Bradley's testimony would have appealed to Launoy. To my own mind it admits of but one explanation: like the evidence of John Grossi and William de Sanvico, it necessarily presupposes the existence of some such authoritative source of information as that reassuring letter (*Consolatoria*) to which Peter Swanyngton refers, and which must have been well known to Walden

¹ MS. Laud. Misc. 722, fol. 114b.

² Long before the discovery of Swanyngton's narrative the Winchester miracle had come under the notice of the chronicler, John Stowe, who died A.D. 1605. He had copied the list of English Carmelite foundations drawn up by Richard Hely, Prior of the White Friars at Maldon, Essex: 'Wintoniae iundator Dominus Petrus de Winton, praepositus ecclesiae S. Helenae ejusdem urbis, qui propter quoddam Mariae miraculum fratres ibidem fundavit.' (MS. Harley. 539 ff. 143-5; Cotton MS. Titus D. X. ff. 127-8, 12).

and his contemporaries, and to the Carmelites generally from the time of St. Simon Stock. The famous French scholar I have always found exceedingly sceptical when treating of the Scapular Promise; but his frequent denials and assumptions never stand the test of scientific criticism, which excludes carping and deals rigorously with *facts*. Still, vague as was his knowledge of the chronology of the Order, his lapses are not quite so conspicuous as those of later hostile critics, who would lead their readers to believe that the celebrated FitzRalph had been prejudiced in favour of the White Friars, being Thomas Walden's intimate friend!¹ This somewhat singular statement (*Armacanus Archiep., amicus Thomae Waldensis*, etc.) was recently recalled by an equally extraordinary suggestion: that the *Viridarium* dated from about the year 1465, two centuries after the death of St. Simon Stock; although the writer in this instance had already assured us, on the authority of John Bale, that Grossi himself died A.D. 1434!² However, it hardly comes within the scope of my present purpose to point out every oversight of this kind, from which the works of medieval Carmelite authors are singularly free, notwithstanding what their modern critics may say to the contrary.³

Neither do I propose to inflict upon my readers any of the impressions formed while discharging—not for the first time—the less congenial duty of wading through those mere personalities that characterized the controversy between the Carmelites and their opponents subsequent to Launoy's rather puerile, if vicious, attack. Still, I am justified in remarking that it was to my ever-increasing surprise I noticed how really essential points appeared totally neglected to present what I considered some trivial detail as if of vital interest to those engaged in so embittered

¹ According to *The Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. xix. p. 194, quoting from Ware (*Bishops*, vol. i. p. 81), I think, FitzRalph died A.D. 1360, some fifteen years before the birth of Thomas Walden!

² Conf. *Monumenta Historica Carmelitana*, pp. 257 ('et obiit A.D. 1434') and 315 ('Hinc sequitur antiquissimam omnium Vitam S. Simonis Stock illam esse quam Johannes Grossi fere ducentis annis post ejus mortem conscripsit,' i.e. A.D. 1465; *ibid.* p. 320).

³ See I. E. RECORD, July, 1904, p. 61.

a dispute. Being required to deal with the subject according to rigorously critical methods, of course all such irrelevant issues had to be eliminated during my investigations, with the result that I found no difficulty whatever in often condensing a whole treatise into a few pages; and even in these latter rarely perceived anything bearing directly on the question of the monastic traditions of the Carmelites, or on the vision of our Lady to St. Simon Stock.¹

It was by this process I at length laid bare the absolutely gratuitous assertions upon the refutation of which many writers of the Order simply wasted their industry, instead of insisting upon a far more satisfactory cause being assigned for the rejection of the testimony of those witnesses whose authority should appeal to the most exacting critics of even our own times.² For the rest, there was always the 'negative evidence of history' to urge against the pretensions of the Carmelites, concerning which argument I may quote what struck me as a very prudent reservation—based on Mabillon's familiar admonition³—made in the I. E. RECORD a few years ago: 'No one knows better than the present writer how delicately the *argumentum a silentio* should be handled on account of the extremely unsatisfactory state of our old records';⁴ although, in the circumstances, it might have been more appropriate to suggest Bellarmine's forcibly expressed conviction: 'Respondeo nihil concludi ex argumentis ab auctoritate negativa, et plus creditur tribus testibus affirmantibus, quam mille nihil dicentibus.'⁵

Well, I have now submitted the evidence of my own three witnesses, who were manifestly unaware of the historical importance of those casual references to what they themselves regarded as a matter of indisputable fact

¹ I happen to have by me a very valuable collection of works occasioned by that controversy, some of them exceedingly rare.

² Especially the testimony of those quoted in my article on 'The Monastic Traditions of the Carmelites.' I. E. RECORD, January, 1911.

³ See *Traite des études monastiques*, p. ii. c. xiii.

⁴ I. E. RECORD, March, 1904, which the reader may compare with the opinion expressed in the *Monumenta Historica Carmelitana*, p. 343: 'Magis tamen me movet silentium auctorum.'

⁵ *De Rom. Pontif.*, l. ii. cap. 8.

—upon whose authority I should implicitly rely, had I never heard of Swanyngton's narration. It is hardly necessary to add that I am quite convinced of the authenticity of the MS. found at Bordeaux, utterly rejecting the assumption of its having been 'manipulated' in any way by the discoverer.¹ Were it permissible, I could submit some interesting illustrations from personal experience to show that equally opportune discoveries have been made in our own days by those engaged in [historical research, one instance being, if anything, somewhat more remarkable than the case of Father John Chéron. For I myself have been instrumental in bringing to light an original document, numbered among 'hopelessly lost' MSS. for several hundred years, and deemed of vital importance to a particular cause in which I happened to be very intimately concerned at the time of the discovery. I do not know whether the cause to which I refer would meet with hostile criticism at the hands of those writers who have professed themselves no less sceptical than Launoy concerning the Scapular Promise, nor whether they would insist upon either my superiors or myself producing the original document in question, once we should have volunteered our express assurance of its genuineness and identity.²

As for the Sabbatine Indulgence, considered from the historical standpoint, I have not space at my disposal to deal with the subject in a manner that would be likely to prove acceptable to my readers. The distinguished Jesuit theologian who replied to Launoy's attack on the Scapular Devotion quotes Baconthorpe and de Horneby, the contemporaries of Pope John XXII., to establish the authenticity of the privilege as described in verified copies of the famous Papal Bull proclaiming the extraordinary new favour granted to the clients of Our Lady of Carmel.³ He does so, because these renowned English White Friars

¹ See I. E. RECORD, July, 1904, p. 64.

² Of course this article has received the formal approval of the Superior-General of the Discalced Carmelites. (Romae, 25 Januarii, 1911.)

³ 'Scapulare Partheno-Carmeliticum.' See note at the end of this article, p. 287.

enjoyed special opportunities of consulting official documents relating to the history of their Order, which were then kept in the archives of the London monastery. Launoy would complain of the negligence of the Carmelites of the sixteenth century in their having failed to preserve the actual Bull announcing the Sabbatine Indulgence.¹ Those acquainted with the history of the suppression of the English monasteries may be inclined, like myself, to regard this as very unreasonable; even if they did not know of the existence of a number of authentic copies, including several made in the course of the fifteenth century.² As a matter of fact, the evidence shows that verified copies of important documents of this kind were at once distributed among the principal monasteries of the Order to insure their contents being conveyed to the religious with the least possible delay.³ I could cite the testimony of John Grossi himself to this effect;⁴ or that of the apostate Bale, whose authority seems of such moment to recent critics of the Scapular Devotion, adding that even after his sad defection he still upheld the authenticity of the Bull of Pope John XXII., utilizing it in one of his most scurrilous diatribes against the Papacy.⁵

Bale, unhappily, was but one of those wretched men who were then endeavouring to deaden the voice of conscience by calumniating all priests and religious steadfast

¹ *De Sabbatinae Bullae Privilegio*, op. c. p. III.

² I may mention the three copies at the Vatican which I have not yet examined; so I cannot say, for certain, whether they are merely transcripts of a much later date.

³ John Bale speaks of copies of the 'Sabbatine Bull' which he himself had seen, *tam in Anglia quam in Hannonia*, and we may assume it was from the former he transcribed the copy given in MS. Harley, 1819, f. 61b. This does not appear to have occurred to the writer in the I. E. RECORD, April, 1904, pp. 331 sqq. In note 17 to the same article a useful quotation is given to show why many original Papal Bulls are not to be found in the *Regesta* (*Papal Registers*, vol. i. pref.).

⁴ Rouen MS. No. 772: 'Regula Fratrum Ordinis B.M. de Monte Carmeli per Innocentium Papam Quartum correcta, qui sedit anno MCCXLVII., cujus Bullam ego Frater Joannes Grossi, Prior-Generalis, vidi in conventu Londoniarum et Coloniae.' Further positive evidence of Grossi's visit to England!

⁵ 'Istam apparitionem cum inauditis indulgentiis, et animarum a purgatorio liberationibus, in quolibet ejus festo et in sabbatorum Missis, in quadam Bulla legi. . . . Quae etiam Romae anno Domini 1530, sub Clemente VII. renovata fuit'—(*Scriptores Britanniae*, vol. i. p. 401).

in their sacred calling. So that if he, or any of those other apostates, suspected the possibility of forgery in such a connexion, is it credible that he would have omitted to chronicle the fact of what he would stigmatize as a fraud (or 'fable') being encouraged by the Holy See for the infamous reason which he actually assigns?¹ It forms no part of my task to enter on a defence of the Sabbatine Indulgence, especially just now, when the new legislation regarding scapulars encourages the faithful to avail themselves all the more fervently of this great privilege, dating back to the pontificate of John XXII., as every truly critical student of the question is well aware.² However, should anyone desire to weigh the evidence as presented by an 'independent witness,' I have already indicated a work which meets Launoy's frivolous objections in detail.³ And if I have singled out the French sceptic

¹ 'Procuracione pecuniaria,' *ibid.* See I. E. RECORD, January, 1911, p. 98.

² 'Sabbatino, quod dicunt, Scapularis B.M.V. de Monte Carmelo Privilegio non excepto'—(*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, vol. iii. p. 23, die 15 Decembris, 1910).

³ *Scapulare Paritheno-Carmeliticum Illustratum, et Defensum*, A. R. P. Theophilo Raynaudo, Societatis Jesu Theologo. Romae M.DCC.XXX. This work was first published A.D. 1653. The learned author treats of the Confraternity of the Brown Scapular also (*ibid.* p. 186), and proves very conclusively, I think, that St. Louis of France *did* wear the habit (or Scapular) of the Carmelites. It is interesting to note that I have lately come across an original 'Charter granted to the chaplain of the Confraternity Altar in St. John's Church by Robert Brussone, Prior of the White Friars of Perth, 28th of March, 1508.' (Archives of King James the Sixth's Hospital, Perth; *conf. The Ecclesiastical Annals of Perth* (Fittis), under A.D. 1508.)

Father Raynaud follows Bellarmine in warning his readers of the dangers, and 'de inanimate argumenti ducti ab auctoritate negativa,' p. 188. I add this because it has been suggested that one might reasonably expect to find some allusion to the origin of the Scapular Devotion in ancient Manuals (the Ordinances, etc.) of the Confraternity (I. E. RECORD, July, 1904, p. 74). I failed to grasp the reason for any such expectation; and after having consulted a number of Manuals of this kind—'Antiquissimae Archi-Confraternitatis S. Mariani Scapularis'—I discovered nothing bearing on the subject, except in a single instance, where a copy of the Sabbatine Indulgence was inserted at the end. ('Bulla Sabbathina,' Augustae, A.D. 1746.) If asked, what about those various guilds connected with Carmelite churches in the Middle Ages?—such as the 'Confraternity of Goldsmiths' in the church of the Carmelites at Avignon, A.D. 1413 (Carpentras MS. No. 886, and the Avignon MS., No. 1959, f. 1)—I should say that, in my opinion, they were quite similar to the 'Commercial' and other sodalities attached to churches of the Order at the present day.

for particular notice in this paper, it is because compared with his attack on the Scapular Devotion I should pronounce the difficulties raised by later critics—notably those occurring to certain recent writers—as trifling in the extreme. Still, even doubts of this nature may occasion disquiet in the minds of readers not in a position to consult authoritative sources of information, or unsuspecting of latent fallacies upon which the most specious arguments are often based.

JAMES P. RUSHE, O.D.C.

FRAGMENT FROM 'LEABHAR BREAC'—II

THIS second copy of above¹ is from H. 3. 17 (T.C.D.), cols. 837-839. On account of the number of variants, I have copied the whole tract. The triads at the end have not been printed by Meyer in his *Triads of Ireland*,² and as they have a bearing on the question of Irish Monasticism I include them here. H. 3. 17 is a bulky, irregular, vellum volume of Irish historical matter. It belonged, in 1666, to Dubaltach mac Firbisigh, as an entry at foot of page 1 shows, but the rest of the matter is much older. The verbal likenesses with other rules may with profit be recalled here.³

CIO IR DECH DO CLEIRECH.	What is meet for a cleric ?
LEIRI DEGRERUTAIN.	Fervour of good meditation.
ḤAIRE MAIRIḤRECH. ⁴	Respect for masters.
EIRGE MOCH MATAIN.	Rising early.
ΔΥΡΟΜΑΝ ΕCΘΑ.	Great fear of death.
ḤUAḤAD ḤAḤḤOINE.	A few good people.
(Col. 838) ḤREḤ IRḤNAIḤḤI.	Continual prayer.
IMḤABAIL OḤBETH [].	Avoidance of youth [?].
ḤENUM BECC OIBḤI.	Doing little work.
ḤEIT FOR TEPCCUIT.	To have little property.
ḤAM FḤI BANḤCÁLA.	To give up women-folk.
NEḤFḤICHNAM ÉḤAIḤ.	Indifference for clothing.
FÁILTE CEN CLUIḤEḤA.	Joy without levity [?].
MEḤMA FḤI FḤUIḤE.	Mind towards wisdom.
ḤREḤ LÉIḤINO.	Continual study.
TIMḤIBE COTAILA.	Shortening of sleep.
RÉIO LÉIḤINO FḤAIḤE.	Easy reading of history.
RÉO PḤOICEḤT CANOINE.	Easy preaching of the Canon.
ḤNAḤ FḤOICEḤIL.	Continual teaching.
ḤUL DEḤ MAIRIḤRECH. ⁴	Right masterly go [?].
SCELUḤAD SCḤEḤP[r]A.	Story-telling of Scripture.

¹ Vide I. E. RECORD, xxviii. p. 475.

² R.I.A., Todd Series, vol. xiii.

³ I. E. RECORD, loc. cit.

⁴ So MS. I have translated *mairiḥrech* as in *L. B.*

Ordo necairpe.	Order of the church.
Timcell cpor.	Circuit of crosses [?].
Comrad ne rruir.	Converse with nobility.
Tabairt nalmrana.	Giving of alms.
Tabairt coibren.	Giving of confessions.
Ñuacthao naicept.	Fewness of [?].
Frucaí menčí.	Frequent discourses.
Si quir ric legir, nombia nem 7 calam 7 raegal corop ren iar mbreic na Screptna naimi.	<i>Si quis sic legit</i> , he shall have Heaven and earth, and the world, that he may be happy according to the judgment of the Holy Scripture.
Imgabail cornama.	Avoidance of contention.
Coibrin glana.	Pure confessions.
Cuide glan.	Clean heart.
Sacarbaicc ¹ minicc.	Frequent sacrifice.
Atcomairc menčí .i. da maiz[ir]cir.	Frequent questions, i.e., to his master.
Omun díchmaircc .i. gair.	Fear of transgression, i.e., of theft.
Nemtecht tar réir.	Not violating obedience.
Forcomec riagla.	Observance of rule.
Corc trua ailtine.	Restraint on joy.
Stemna fri gairba.	Patience in adversity.
Fir tar eir ga.	Truth after falsehood.
Tua tar eir labna.	Silence after speech.
Seairc 7 omun in Coimced.	Love and fear of the Lord.
Mircair in domain.	Hatred of the world.
Dezdaca him miadamlaca.	Humility in honour.
Genur i naitiuo.	Chastity in [?].
Erlabna hi mbocta.	Generosity to the poor.
Aprcandaio in imac .i. hi rai- briur.	Abstinence in abundance, i.e., in riches.
Timdibe dizi.	Diminution of drink.
Appa im [a] coir.	A sandal on [his] foot.
Menci almran do carait craibio.	Frequent almsgiving to a pious friend.
Epnaisci leir.	Fervent prayer.
Legino sneppach.	Continual study.
Sneim fri rait.	Power against evil.

¹ *Irish Theological Quarterly*, i. pp. 58-61; 61, n. 1.

Ʋoʒlam hi Ʋanctais.

ʒaire Ʋruici.

Cometa imteacta .i. cin
imteact a haenui 7 cin
Ʋiubal acht Ʋri haircear
7 imteact cleirceide mo
uair do ʒena.

Eccore Ʋecamail.

Crao do uilʒuo.

Ʋimur do uilʒoi.¹

Coccao Ʋri toil.

Ailʒine cin laxa.

Meirce do Ʋomoin.

Eirʒi le cet ʒut mainiʒ
uƲech.²

Sar[ao na] mboct .i. mci
occa mbia.

uƲat do nocht.

Deoʒ nicaodach.

Ʋimorʒain (col. 389) Ʋula .i.
ʒan ƲiƲoedain neic do
cleirch acht a liubar.

Morao ƲiƲnoe.

Umaloid co Ʋecamlacht.

Cobraide aicno.

Menma ipel.

Coenuicraacht cƲiue.

Searc braeapoa.

Ʋorcocht cech comneraim.

Deiʒceirce Ʋor cach.

Mircair ecnaiz.

Inoapoa ƲoƲuir.

Morao ceo macurra.

Tairnem cach uile.

Omun in Coimoeo.

ʒrao braeapoa.

Ʋrocaine cin uicell.

Soeoirce aicno.

Aim meppaizci.

Learning from the saints.

Respect for superiors.

Restraint on going, i.e., not to
go alone, and to walk only
with attention and clerical
demeanour when one does.

Patient countenance.

To forgive offence.

To banish pride.

Battle with the will.

Joy without laxity.

To avoid drunkenness.

To rise at the first voice of a
master.

Food to the poor, i.e., he who
has it.

Clothing to the naked.

Restraint of the eyes, i.e., a
cleric should gaze con-
tinually at nobody except
at his book.

Glorification of truth.

Humility with patience.

Firmness of mind.

Humble mind.

Sincerity of heart.

Brotherly love.

Helping every neighbour.

Good testimony for all.

Hatred of detraction.

Banishment of murmuring.

Magnification of all good.

Repression of all evil.

Fear of the Lord.

Brotherly love.

Mercy without neglect [?].

Docility of mind.

Moderate fasting.

¹ Vide I. E. RECORD, xxvii. p. 504, 1aƲ uilʒoi cech clám.

² So MS. I have translated maizircech as in L. B.

uaiti réire.	Parcity of food.
mence fúidairé.	Frequent watching.
foimur éomairle.	Solidity of advice.
Comlabra éobrais.	Firm speech.
foirtu fúu hingsneim.	Peace in persecution.
Tairingdairé fír.	True promise.
fír do éomalluo.	To fulfil the truth.
Impadad Dé.	Meditation on God.
feite diccnio.	Uprightness of mind.
neitad irri.	Strengthening of faith.
Mircair in cenótar.	Hatred of this world.
Seice in alltar.	Longing for the other world.
ḡá cétfuro nouit fínim. fínit.	
Trí buada crabadó :	Three virtues of piety :
Maic tar eirri nuilcc.	Good in return for evil.
hínirri fúu hárd.	Humility in exaltation.
Stemna fúu ḡarbu.	Patience in adversity.
Δετρί αδοδα hmgabta ic	Three things to be avoided by
crabuo :	piety :
Cluar fúu molad.	An ear for praise.
Menma fúu maírri.	A mind for beauty.
Toeb fúu rírraegul.	Trusting in an eternal world.
Trí boeffra cleirig :	Three vices of a cleric :
fúirmeo Δ coibrin.	Revealing his confession. ¹
Coabar cornom in alltar.	[] contention in a
	pilgrim.
Δónacul baic na ḡeotar.	Burial in a place where
Δ écnairc.	his Requiem will not be
	chanted.
Trí hínófra ecátra :	Three hard things [?] of a
Manach do éorcc arad.	church :
Óḡ do éorc fín.	A monk to reprimand an
	abbot.
Doirb do éorc ecnaou.	A young man to reprimand
	an old man.
	An ignorant man to reprimand a learned one.

¹ Father Paul Walsh: 'fúirmeo Δ coibrin co Δ bar,' 'keeping his conscience till death,' *v.* fuismim, O'Dav. (*Archiv.* ii.). 'Keeping his conscience' = not going to confession (but *v.* Wind., *Wörterbuch*, *s.* fuismeadach, m. e.).

Δ τρι cloena .i. δτλαech
 éccraibech inna airchin-
 decht.¹ Mac becc ina
 fertaiger.¹ Coitech cipe
 oíuacra trath.

Tréde slanar cipe dune .i.
 Soóipee 7 mírcair in
 cennóair 7 sepe inó
 ailtair.

Tréde bír inheir .i. anecna,
 Roínócliuat, Tola tua.

Cia ír neíra do írínn. Fézad
 roezail 1 fót.

Cia ír neíra do nim. Crabad
 oen bíó.

Three bad faults, i.e., a useless,
 undevout fellow as Air-
 chindech. A little boy as
 Fertaiges. And a cock to
 announce the hours.

Three things that purify the
 heart of a man: Docility
 and hatred of this world
 and longing for the next.

Three things that be in heresy:
 Ignorance, pride of in-
 tellect, silent [?].

What is nearest to Hell?
 Gazing long on this world.

What is nearest to Heaven?
 Piety of one meal.²

MAC ECLÁISE.

[The following is the note referred to above:—

Dubaltdé Mac Siolla íora móir me an Dubaltdis me
 Seumuir me íribirís lecan 1 tír íraera, fer an leabairr
 a°. x¹, 1666.]

¹ *Ériu*, I. 44. In macclerpech ír é ba haírchinóech 7 ba íecnar 7 ba
 ferpichigir 7 ba coic írin píamóis. 'The clerk was erenagh, vice-abbot,
 steward, and cook in the refectory' (*Story of S. Colman and Guaire*).

² i.e., holy fasting.

Notes and Queries

THEOLOGY

THE PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF NEW MARRIAGE LAW

REV. DEAR SIR,—In a recent handbook the author says, concerning the new Marriage Law, that any persons attempting marriage either before a Registrar or non-Catholic minister are excommunicated, and may be refused Catholic burial.

If persons who violate the new Marriage Law are excommunicated, is the excommunication *ipso jure* or *ab homine*, *latae sententiae* or *ferendae sententiae*? I am told on good authority that parties who attempt marriage before an heretical minister i.e., *in a non-Catholic place of worship*, are excommunicated by virtue of the *Constitutio Apostolicae Sedis*. What is the precise meaning of the Constitution; and why should the excommunication not apply to persons who marry in a Registrar's office? In our diocese the clergy are instructed to deny any persons the Sacraments who attempt marriage either before a Registrar or a non-Catholic minister, except in danger of death. Is not this minor excommunication? Yet both Taunton in his *Law of the Church*, and the writer of the article on excommunication in the *Catholic Encyclopædia* maintain that minor excommunication is a dead letter. Is this true?

I shall be glad of a little illumination on this matter at your earliest convenience.—Yours, etc.,

LUX IN TENEBRIS.

1. A Catholic who attempts to celebrate marriage in a Protestant church, or with the rites and ceremonies of the Protestant Ritual, *ipso facto* incurs the first excommunication of the *Constitutio Apostolicae Sedis*, which is specially reserved to the Holy See. He holds communion in the rites and ceremonies of an heretical church, and thereby shows the 'favour' to heretics of which the Constitution speaks.

2. Very probably the same is true if a Catholic attempts to celebrate marriage before a Protestant minister acting in his capacity of a Protestant minister, even though no prayers of the Protestant Ritual are recited, and even

though the celebration takes place outside the Protestant church. When the matrimonial consent is externated before a Protestant minister, acting in his capacity of a Protestant minister and not in the capacity of a civil registrar, the celebration necessarily wears a religious aspect and as such shows 'favour' to the sect to which the minister belongs. In its instructions to the Bishops of Hanover (17th February, 1864), the S. Inq. made the following declaration:—

Verum enimvero quotiescunque minister haereticus censeatur *veluti sacris addictus, et quasi Parochi munere fungens*, non licet Catholicae parti una cum haeretica matrimoniale consensum coram tali ministello praestare, eo quia adhiberetur ad quandam religiosam caeremoniam complendam, et pars catholica ritui haeretico se consociaret; unde oriretur quaedam implicita haeresi adhesio, ac proinde illicita omnino haberetur cum haeticis in divinis communicatio. . . . Sciant insuper Parochi, si interrogentur a contrahentibus, vel si certe noverint eos adituros ministrum haeticum sacris addictum ad consensum matrimoniale praestandum, se silere non posse, sed monere eosdem debere sponso de gravissimo peccato quot patrant, et *de censuris in quas incurrunt*.

In this decree it is stated that a Catholic who externates matrimonial consent before an heretical minister who is *sacris addictus, et quasi Parochi munere fungens*, is guilty of unlawful communication in divine things with heretics and incurs the censures attached to such a crime. In the case contemplated the Protestant minister is *sacris addictus, et quasi Parochi munere fungens*, since he acts as a Protestant minister and not as a civil registrar. This is the common teaching of theologians,¹ but Gasparri² is of a different opinion. He points to the argument of the Instruction: 'Non licet catholicae parti una cum haeretica matrimoniale consensum coram tali ministello praestare, eo quia adhiberetur ad quandam religiosam caeremoniam complendam, et pars catholica ritui haeretico se consociaret.' According to Gasparri this reason is not verified when no religious rite is performed by the assisting minister, and consequently

¹ Cf. Genicot, ii. n. 520; Wernz, *Jus Decretalium*, iv. n. 588, not. 42
Santi Leitner, iv. n. 194.

² *De Matrimonio*, n. 467.

the excommunication is not incurred in the circumstances. The reply to Gasparri's argument is that the externation of matrimonial consent before a Protestant minister as such is of itself a religious ceremony, inasmuch as it implies the assistance of the parson as a Protestant minister. In practice the opinion of Gasparri is probable; hence the excommunication is not incurred by the Catholic party.

3. There is no *ipso facto* censure attached by the Constitution *Apostolicae Sedis* to marriage or attempted marriage celebrated before a civil registrar; in such a marriage there is no communication in divine things which shows favour to heresy or heretics as such, and which would accordingly incur the first excommunication of the *Apostolicae Sedis*. This is sufficiently clear from a reply of the S. Inq. (23rd August, 1877):—

Utrum in contractis matrimoniis (cum haereticis) pastores animarum partem poenitentem, dummodo seclusum sit scandalum, tuta conscientia ad receptionem sacramentorum admittere valeant?

R. Quoad matrimonia valida ad sacramenta percipienda posse admitti sine praevia renovatione consensus, sed ab iisdem percipiendis arcendos, . . . donec obtinuerint absolutionem a censuris incursis una cum poenitentiis salutaribus, *casu quo contraxerint coram ministro haeretico*.

Quoad vero matrimonia invalida . . . non esse admittendos ad receptionem sacramentorum . . . nisi obtinuerint prius absolutionem a censuris incursis una cum poenitentiis salutaribus, *casu quo matrimonium attentaverint coram ministro acatholico*.

The final clause of this reply implies that the censure is incurred only when the marriage is celebrated before an heretical minister. Canonists, like Wernz¹ and Gasparri,² agree in this teaching.

4. Though Bishops are reminded by the Holy See that they should use censures sparingly³ in matters of this kind, it is competent for them to impose censures either *latae sententiae* or *ferendae sententiae*, to be incurred for the violation of the laws of the Church which forbid the celebration

¹ *Jus Decretalium*, iv. p. 831.

² *De Matrimonio*, n. 467.

³ S. Cong. Prop. Fide, 16th March, 1638.

of marriage in a Registry Office. Of course in some countries, on account of the law of the land, it is obligatory to have a civil marriage either before or after the religious ceremony, and in these places it is lawful for Catholics to submit to the law on condition that the true matrimonial consent be externated, not at the civil, but at the religious ceremony. Outside such circumstances, it is unlawful for Catholics to co-operate with the civil law in its usurpation of authority to deal, not only with the civil effects of marriage, but also with the marriage bond itself; and Ordinaries can inflict suitable punishments on those who violate their obligations in this matter. The punishment current in the diocese of my correspondent apparently is an enforcement of the excommunication of the Constitution *Apostolicae Sedis* in the case of those who celebrate marriage before a Protestant minister. In the case of those who attempt marriage in a Registry Office, the episcopal instruction is, at least, an expression of the ordinary rules of theology which forbid the admission of public sinners to the sacraments and which by no means are equivalent to the obsolete minor excommunication. No information has been supplied which would enable me to say whether or not there is, in addition, a local censure or reservation which is incurred by those who celebrate marriage before the Registrar.

**ARE CLANDESTINE MARRIAGES BETWEEN CATHOLICS
VALID CIVIL CONTRACTS IF ALL LEGAL CONDITIONS
HAVE BEEN FULFILLED?**

REV. DEAR SIR,—I shall be grateful if you will kindly state in the next issue of the I. E. RECORD whether, in these countries now, there can be a valid civil contract of marriage between Catholics who go through the ceremony in a Registrar's office, or before a Protestant Minister of religion. I, of course, understand that the State *regards* the contract as valid, and can insist on the civil effects, but is it really a *valid civil contract*? I was under the impression that it was not valid even as a civil contract, but the following carefully worded statement on page 3 of the *Catholic Directory*, 1911, for England, makes me doubt:—

‘Such marriages, if they are so celebrated, are indeed, for all the civil effects and purposes of marriage, valid and binding

contracts *under the civil law*, if the conditions and requirements of the civil marriage law are fulfilled ; but they are null and void *before God*, and the parties are not, in the sight of God, husband and wife.'—I am, yours faithfully,

SACERDOS.

It is Catholic teaching that amongst Christians there is no real distinction between the sacrament and the contract. If there is no sacrament there is no matrimonial contract, and if there is a matrimonial contract there is also a sacrament. It is also Catholic teaching that, inasmuch as there is question of a sacred contract, the Church and the Church alone has the right to lay down the conditions required for the validity of the contract and consequently for the validity of the sacrament.

If all legal conditions are fulfilled, the State regards the marriage as a valid contract and would punish for bigamy either of the parties who married again during the lifetime of the other ; but unless the conditions imposed by the Church are fulfilled there is no valid matrimonial contract, either ecclesiastical or civil. Though the State might regard the contract as valid, it cannot make it really valid. Having no power over the matrimonial bond itself, the State acts without authority in imposing the conditions which, in opposition to Church law, it makes necessary and deems sufficient for the validity of the contract. Hence, its laws have efficacy only so far as the mere civil effects of marriage are concerned ; amongst these are matters relating to dowry, alimony, succession, and the like.

Since, however, the State regards the contract as a valid civil contract, it insists, as far as it can, that matrimonial rights be observed. The Catholic Church also, though it recognizes no valid contract, insists that the parties make reparation for any scandal or injury of which their action has been the cause. Usually this reparation can adequately be made only by the celebration of a true marriage—by the revalidation of the marriage invalidly contracted. Hence, apart from exceptional circumstances, the Church does not favour the separation of parties who, by reason of the impediment of clandestinity, have contracted

an invalid marriage ; and it is willing to give ample facilities whereby the marriage can be made valid. The most notable of these facilities is the *sanatio in radice*, which is given in cases of special difficulty and which enables the marriage to be made valid without a renewal of consent; if a matrimonial consent was given and has never been withdrawn.

SATURDAY-NIGHT DANCES

REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly say in the I. E. RECORD what attitude priests are to take with regard to the Saturday-night dances. Some of the clergy seem to be indifferent to them, for some reason or other ; a few are against them, passively ; while others openly favour them by giving permission for such dances to take place in the parochial schools. Since such a diversity of practice exists, it is very desirable that an expression of opinion relative to these Saturday-night dances, or rather Sunday-morning dances, should be sought for.

SACERDOS.

So many circumstances must be taken into consideration in connexion with amusements such as the Saturday-night dances, it is impossible to lay down a hard and fast rule which universally holds. Some people allow no amusements to interfere with the observance of their Sunday obligations, while others are not so steadfast in their adherence to the practice of their religion. Some districts have Catholic traditions which safeguard their inhabitants from violations of the laws of the Church, while others are not so fortunate. The difficulties of rightly appraising the influence of such amusements are increased enormously by the fact that usually the mixture of good and evil is found in the same localities, so that pastors are often at a loss to know whether the benefits are sufficiently great to justify the dangers which arise from the permission to hold the dances. Another element of doubt occurs when there is reason to believe that opposition on the part of priests will merely have the effect of driving the evil into undesirable surroundings, and of thereby doing more harm than good. It is small wonder, then, that priests vary in their attitudes towards these amusements. Universal condemna-

tion and universal approbation are equally out of place; condemnation is merited only when, all things considered, the abuses are serious; approbation, or at least indifference, is deserved only when serious abuses do not arise; but if an individual here and there abuses the occasion, there is no need to condemn the whole system.

The Maynooth Statutes lay down two rules which are important not merely when Saturday-night dances, but also when other dances are considered: (1) All priests, secular and regular, who are engaged in the work of the ministry, are commanded to prevent with every means at their disposal dances that are repugnant to Christian modesty; and confessors are warned that they do not fulfil the duties of their office if in any way or under any pretext they permit or excuse such dances. (2) The clergy are, moreover, not to allow dances in any building under their guardianship if drink be immoderately distributed, or if young people of both sexes assemble in the absence of their elders.¹ Evidently the position of the priest ought to be one of watchful supervision, so that every tendency towards what is wrong or unbecoming might be suppressed with firmness combined with paternal solicitude.

OBLIGATION OF CLERGY TO KNOW AND ACT ON NEW DECREES.—THE SHORT FORM OF EXTREME UNCTION AND RECENT MEDICAL THEORIES

REV. DEAR SIR,—I. New decrees are being published from time to time mostly bearing on a priest's duties on the mission. These duly find their way to the pages of the I. E. RECORD. But some priests do not read the I. E. RECORD, and therefore have not the opportunity of seeing the decrees. What are their obligations as far as knowing the decrees and acting in accordance with them?

2. The Holy Office, April 25, 1906, decreed that in real necessity the form 'Per istam sanctam Unctionem indulgeat tibi Dominus quidquid deliquisti. Amen,' is sufficient in the administration of Extreme Unction. What is to be said of the value of this very brief form in view of the words of the Rev.

¹ *Acta et Decreta*, nn. 320, 321.

Dr. Geniesse, Rome, which has found favour with the Holy Father, and of the various authorities quoted by Antonelli, Sanford, and Ferreres, all of which would seem to indicate that real death may not take place for hours after apparent death? It is even stated that the only sure sign of death is putrefaction, even in an advanced stage. Neither can the difficulty of remembering the words of the decree so seldom used be overlooked.

ROMANUS.

1. By reason of the pastoral charge entrusted to them, the clergy are bound to employ the means that are necessary to keep them in touch with the laws and regulations which affect them in the discharge of their duties, and to act on these laws and regulations when they know them. There are many ways at their disposal which serve to give them the desired information, and they will fulfil their obligation if they adopt any suitable way of acquiring knowledge. It would, indeed, be useful for them to get the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, or some magazine like the I. E. RECORD, which publishes from time to time the important Papal documents; but it would be hard to assert that there is an obligation to become subscribers to such magazines so long as at conferences and in other ways they can glean the necessary information with substantial accuracy.

2. According to modern medical theories often real death does not follow for a long time after apparent death. This does not imply that the short form of Extreme Unction is of no utility, since apparent and real death often occur at the same instant, and it is practically impossible to tell when the two are not simultaneous. In practice, then, the short form should be used when there is danger that apparent death would occur before the long form with its corresponding anointings could be administered.

OLD AGE PENSIONS—DOUBTFUL FULFILMENT OF
STATUTORY CONDITION OF AGE

REV. DEAR SIR,—I have recently had a difficulty proposed to me, and as it is one which may easily arise again in the future, and may perhaps interest others of your readers as well as myself, I should be grateful if you would give me your opinion on the matter.

Several years ago a certain person got insured, and gave what he believed to be about his correct age. At present, however, he has reason to doubt the accuracy of the statement he then made, but being unable to get either his baptismal or birth certificate, he cannot settle his doubt. According to the age then given his present age should be sixty-eight, but he is in doubt as to whether he is not in reality seventy. He is now anxious to apply for the old age pension. Can he conscientiously do so, and at the same time continue to pay the Insurance company the premium originally fixed on the supposition that his age is now less than seventy? I know that a person cannot use two opposite probable opinions about the same case. Can it not, however, be sustained with reason that he is not following two opposite probable opinions? Can we not hold that the law in case of real doubt as to a person's age, does not rigorously intend to exclude him from the benefit of the pension? Does not the somewhat generous way in which it has been applied favour this interpretation? Consequently, if the person honestly declares his doubt, and yet receives the pension, would it not be reasonable to hold that he is now acting on a certain right as far as the law of the land is concerned, and is only using a probability on the insurance question?

But could he apply for the old age pension, and without mentioning the doubt, enter his age as seventy on the application form? I personally think not. Still, I should like to have your opinion.

I presume that you will agree with me that in neither case is there any obligation of mentioning to the officer in control of the old age pensions that he has been insured on the supposition that he is now less than seventy. For that would prejudice his case and make him less likely to obtain the pension than one who had exactly the same doubt, but who was not insured. For the officer would then be inclined to believe that he is certainly under seventy.

SACERDOS.

It is a principle of theology that a person cannot justly take possession of property to which he has only a probable right when the probability is one of fact and the property is already in the possession of the other doubtful owner. Hence a person who only probably is seventy years of age has no right, *in virtue of that probability*, to accept the

pension, since the probability is one of fact, and the money is in the possession of the Government which is the other doubtful owner in the case.

At the same time, the applicant who is probably seventy years of age, can certainly justly take the pension, because we know from the administration¹ of the Old Age Pensions Act that the Government is quite willing to give the pension, with an absolute right of ownership, to anybody who probably has reached the statutory age, if the probability is a true probability based on solid reasons. On the consent of the Treasury, and not on the use of a probable opinion as such, the applicant can, with a clear conscience, take the pension in the circumstances contemplated, so that in theory as well as in practice he has a certain right to the pension.

Is this right taken away because he continues to pay the premium in accordance with the original agreement which was drawn up between him and the Insurance company? There is good ground for saying that he is not bound to abstain from taking the old age pension in this hypothesis, since he is not using two probable opinions in his favour in the same case, but is rather acting on the consent of the Government which gives him an absolute right to the pension once he is in a position of insoluble doubt about the fulfilment of the statutory condition of age. Nobody would say, for instance, that if a dispensation were obtained from a doubtful law the recipient would be debarred from using the dispensation on the plea that he also uses in his favour a probable opinion which is opposed to the existence of the doubtful law. Again, nobody would say that, if the beneficiary of the abstention from the use of two opposing probable opinions were to make the abstainer a gift of any rights acquired in this way, there would be an obligation in justice not to accept the donation. In the case under consideration the Treasury dispenses from the

¹ In the House of Commons, April 28, 1910, Mr. Hobhouse, stated, on behalf of the Treasury, that 'when people were on the borderland of the statutory age, and when neither they nor anyone else knew their exact age, it was reasonable that they should get the benefit of the doubt.' On the same occasion he said that the Treasury would not exact restitution in the case of those who got the pension without fraud, even though it be found out that a mistake had been made.

certain fulfilment of the statutory age, or makes an absolute gift to the applicant, so that he can justly accept the old age pension even though he also uses the opposing probability in his favour in his transactions with the Insurance company.

In reply to the supplementary question, I would say that truthfulness would usually demand that the real state of the case should be mentioned. Still, if it is certainly probable that the applicant is seventy years of age, he would not sin against justice if he were to take the pension without making mention of the doubt. If an applicant were to state that he was seventy-two when he was in reality only seventy, he would sin against veracity, but he would, nevertheless, be justified in taking the pension for which he was duly qualified. In the same way veracity would usually demand a declaration of the doubt, but the pension could be accepted if it is certainly probable that the statutory age has been reached, even though silence has been maintained about the doubt.

I agree with my correspondent in holding that there is no obligation to tell anything about the Insurance policy to the officer in charge of the old age pensions, but the applicant must remember that if he gets the old age pension he may be compelled by the Insurance company to prove his age.

J. M. HARTY.

CANON LAW

THE NEW IMPEDIMENTS TO RELIGIOUS PROFESSION— THE DECREE AND SUBSEQUENT REPLIES

WE have received several communications regarding a Roman Decree affecting the reception of postulants into religious Orders of women, published in the last December number of the I. E. RECORD.¹ It bears the date January 4, 1910, and was promulgated in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* on the following February 15.² It has, therefore, been now in force for over twelve months.

As several of our correspondents have touched on the

¹ Page 651.

² Vol. ii. n. 2, pp. 63, 64.

same points, and as the enquiries taken together cover practically all the sections of the new regulation, it will save time and trouble if we discuss the Decree as a whole.

On September 15, 1909, the same Congregation¹ had issued the Decree *Ecclesia Christi*,² establishing new impediments to the reception of candidates into the religious life. It applied, however, only to religious Orders of men. The Decree *Sanctissimus*, with which we are now concerned, merely extends the same regulations to religious Orders of women; though there are a few minor changes in the phraseology that, viewed according to the strict canons of interpretation, seem to some to indicate a slight difference in the discipline to be enforced in regard to each.

After a preamble setting forth what we have stated the Decree proceeds:—

Ideoque, absque speciali venia Sedis Apostolicæ et sub poena nullitatis professionis, non excipiantur sive ad Novitiatum sive ad emissionem votorum, postulantes :

1°. quæ, propria culpa, e collegiis etiam laicis, gravi de causa, expulsæ fuerint ;

2°. quæ a scholis domesticis, in quibus puellæ speciali cura in spem amplectendæ vitæ religiosæ educantur, quacumque ratione dimissæ fuerint ;

3°. quæ, sive ut professæ, sive ut novitiæ, ab alio Ordine vel Congregatione dimissæ fuerint ; vel, si professæ, dispensationem votorum obtinuerint ;

4°. quæ, jam admissæ sive ut professæ sive ut novitiæ in unam provinciam alicujus Ordinis vel Congregationis, et ab ea dimissæ, in eandem vel in aliam ejusdem Ordinis vel Congregationis provinciam recipi nitantur.

I. Under the first head we find excluded from the religious life all 'those who, through their own fault and for a grave reason, have been expelled from educational establishments, whether lay or ecclesiastical.' The regulation—as we see more clearly if we compare the first section with the second—is not confined to pupils educated specially for the religious life nor to institutions specially

¹ The Congregation for Religious Affairs.

² Dated September 7, 1909.

founded for giving an education of that description: all educational establishments, whatever their character and object, and all pupils, whatever the immediate purpose of the education they receive, fall within the limits of the law. To have the penalty incurred there must be an expulsion for a fault that is grave both subjectively (*propria culpa*) and objectively (*gravi de causa*). There is nothing, therefore, to prevent a pupil joining a religious Order if she has, by mistake, been expelled for a fault she never committed, nor, according to eminent authorities,¹ if the offence has been merely against discipline and not of sufficient gravity to constitute, 'in the theological sense, a mortal sin.' The corresponding passage in the *Ecclesia Christi* had, it will be remembered, given as the motive for expulsion 'inhonestos mores . . . vel alia crimina.' This is one of those differences in phraseology, already referred to, from which some commentators are inclined to infer a difference in discipline. But, remembering that the object of the second Decree is merely to extend the application of the first to a class of religious institutions not previously contemplated ('dispositiones decreti . . . 7 Septembris, 1909 . . . ad mulierum quoque Religiosas familias in posterum extendantur'), we are justified in regarding the *causa gravis* of the new Decree as synonymous with the *crimen* of the old, and as representing something much more serious than a mere technical breach of discipline.

If the pupil leaves of her own free choice, there is, needless to say, no impediment incurred. But more difficult cases will arise when, though there has been no formal expulsion, at least no formal expulsion for grave moral fault, something equivalent has taken place: when the pupil, for instance, leaves because she knows that expulsion is imminent, or when, after some serious moral offence has been committed, the Superiors, to spare the feelings of all concerned, induce the parents to remove the child, or give, as the motive for actual dismissal, either some defect for which she is not to blame or some disciplinary offence such as

¹ e.g., M. Jules Besson, in the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, May, 1910, p. 271.

those we have referred to. When the Decree was first published, authorities were divided on such cases. All would agree that the impediment was not incurred when a reasonable doubt existed as to the real cause for the expulsion. But there the agreement ended. Some maintained that there was an impediment whenever a grave moral fault certainly underlay the 'equivalent' expulsion, on the ground that, whatever technical distinctions might be drawn, both classes of pupils were equally guilty and should, according to the intention of the legislator, be subjected to the same penalties.¹ Others took the opposite view, on the general principle that laws imposing disabilities should be interpreted in the strictest possible manner. The question, as regards this particular class of pupils, has not been formally submitted to the Roman Courts, but the answers given under section 2°—with which we shall deal presently—prove that the subsequent profession would be valid, and, when there is question of lay institutions at all events, go far to show that it would be lawful also.²

II. The second class of persons affected by the law are those who have for any reason been dismissed from domestic schools in which girls are educated with a special view to embracing the religious state. Ordinary convent schools are not included in the category, for, though many of the pupils do afterwards embrace the religious life, it is not with that special end in view that the education is given. Nor does the section affect postulants who have been dismissed from a convent before reaching the novitiate—the convents are not included among the 'domestic schools' here contemplated. There is question only of establishments in which the course of instruction given is specially intended to fit the pupils for afterwards entering on the religious life: a course of instruction, therefore, that is gone through before the pupil becomes even a postulant in the religious house itself.

There is no impediment, it will be remarked, if the candidate is merely put off for a time (*dilata*), instead of

¹ Cf. Besson, *ibid.*, p. 272.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 309, 310.

being finally dismissed (*dimissa*). And, in this connexion, some of the commentators very properly remind the Superiors of these institutions of the increased obligation they are now under of exercising very special care before dismissing any of the candidates. According to the new law, a pupil so dismissed can enter no religious Order whatever; and yet it is quite possible that, though unfit for the particular Order which the establishment has in view, she may all the time have a vocation for some Order of a different kind. A useful suggestion is made that the candidates should not be formally enrolled as pupils of the establishment until they have attained an age at which their characters are sufficiently formed to give an indication of their real vocation. Until then they might be taken in as postulants rather than as pupils; dismissal in these circumstances would be followed by none of the canonical disabilities now imposed. And if, after being accepted as pupils, they be found unsuited for the particular Order they wish to enter, though possibly qualified for some other of a less rigorous kind, the Superiors, instead of proceeding to a formal dismissal, would be well advised to put them off for a time, and give them an opportunity of developing a liking for the Order that suits them best.

As regards all affected by section 2°—as well as those falling under section 3°, to be mentioned later on—the question of ‘equivalent’ dismissal has been settled. Various views had been expressed, as we have said, and the question was submitted to the Congregation¹:—

An valide et licite ad Novitiatum admitti possint postulantes qui a Seminariis vel a Collegiis sive ecclesiasticis sive religiosis, vel a Novitiatu dimissi quidem non fuerunt *formaliter*, sed *aequivalenter*, id est, quos Superiores induxerunt vel hortati sunt, ut sponte discederent ne dimitterentur.

To which the answer, given on April 5, 1910, was:—

Valide quidem per se, sed omnino illicite. Et ad fraudes vel abusus e medio tollendos in re tanti momenti, Superiores

¹ *Acta Apost. Sedis*, vol. ii. n. 6, p. 231. The question was proposed in regard to the Decree *Ecclesia Christi*. Hence the masculine gender throughout. But the replies apply equally to the Decree *Sanctissimus*. So those quoted further on.

nullum ex hujusmodi candidatis admittant, antequam per accuratas et secretas informationes a Moderatoribus Seminariorum vel Collegiorum ecclesiasticorum sive religiosorum, vel religiosi Instituti, in quo novitii fuerunt, sub fide juramenti habitas, certi omnino fuerint, candidatos, de quibus agitur, neque formaliter dimissos fuisse, neque aequivalenter. Quod si de candidatis clericis agatur, pariter constare debet de eorum idoneitate litteraria.¹

This throws a new light on the problem. In the original Decree there was no distinction made between a lawful and a valid reception. Not so here. If the postulants have been 'equivalently' dismissed from seminaries or colleges, ecclesiastical or religious, or from a novitiate (and the same principle will apply to 'domestic schools'), that is, if the 'Superiors have induced or exhorted them to leave in order not to be dismissed,' the subsequent profession will be valid, but entirely unlawful. And to prevent fraud and abuses, Superiors are not to admit such postulants until they have had careful, secret, and sworn information from the Superiors of the other institutions, and are certain that there has been no dismissal, formal or equivalent. We conclude, therefore, that :—

1°. If there has been formal dismissal, the profession is invalid.

2°. If the dismissal has been only 'equivalent,' the profession is valid, but the Superiors commit a sin by allowing it to take place.

3°. If the postulant has left of her own free choice, the Superiors of the Order are justified in accepting her ; and,

4°. The same should be said if the Superiors of the first institution had advised her to leave, but were quite prepared to retain her in case she had refused to follow the advice.

5°. Since the Congregation has said nothing about seeking information from the heads of *lay* colleges, we have good grounds for maintaining, as we have said already, that the profession of a pupil 'equivalently' expelled from these institutions is lawful. The question, it is true, had not been formally submitted, but the Congregation, had it wished,

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 232.

might easily have referred to the matter. At the same time we are sure that Superiors will be very slow to receive a postulant when they know for certain that a grave moral fault underlay the 'equivalent' expulsion.

III. We now come to the case of novices and professed nuns who have severed their connexion with one Order, and wish to be received into another. The law states that they cannot be so received if they have been dismissed from the first Order, or if, in case they have been professed, a dispensation from their vows has been granted. As in the last case, there is no need of an expulsion for grave moral fault; dismissal for any grave defect, moral or mental, will entail the disability.

There is manifestly no question of the recognized canonical method of passing (*transitus*) from one Order to another. In certain circumstances, nuns have got this privilege,¹ and there is nothing in the present Decree to indicate that the old law on the subject has been abolished. And it will be noticed, too, that the law does not apply to postulants. Their dismissal from an Order may make others more careful in examining their claims before admitting them. But, as far as the law goes, they are free to enter anywhere.

As for novices, their departure from an Order may take place in a variety of ways. If the Order dismisses them, there can be no doubt that the impediment exists: their profession would be invalid. If they leave because the Superior advises them to do so in order to avoid the unpleasant necessity of actual dismissal, the reply of the Congregation, already given, in regard to 'equivalent' dismissal, will cover their case: the profession would be valid, but unlawful. If they leave entirely of their own free choice, they may seek and obtain lawful and valid admission into any Order they please.

As regards professed nuns, the rule is somewhat more strict. The Superiors of the Order may sometimes dismiss them and thereby free them from all the religious obligations

¹ Cap. *Licet*, 18, *De Regularibus*; Trent, Sess. 25, c. 19, *De Reg.*; Benedict XIV., Const. *Pastor bonus*, 13th Apr. 1744; *S. Congr. Super statu Reg.*, 29th May, 1857; *Norm.* 61.

they have assumed. If this happens, they are in the same position as novices formally dismissed. But, in addition to that, if the professed nun has, even of her own free will and without any encouragement from the Order, sought and obtained a dispensation from her vows, she becomes subject to the penalties imposed by the law, and her subsequent profession is null and void.

On the publication of the Decree, doubts were expressed whether a nun, whose case the law would technically cover, might not be admitted to her final vows if she had already made her first profession. It was urged that it could not be the intention of the Congregation to interfere with rights acquired before the Decree appeared. A decision has settled the question. Her vows will be valid, but the Superiors are bound, under pain of grave sin, 1°, to obtain from her former Superiors 'secret and sworn information about the real cause of her departure,' and, 2°, to 'have solid proof from other sources of her religious moral character and real vocation.'¹ And the same principles apply to the case of a nun who, on the expiration of her temporal vows, refuses to renew them, and leaves the Order. Her vows in another Order will be valid, but, in order to have the profession lawful, her new Superiors must seek and obtain satisfactory information from her former convent. The question put was: 'An recipi valeant ii, qui professionem votorum temporaneorum in aliqua Congregatione emiserunt, sed, peracto tempore, eadem sponte non renovarunt'; and the answer given: 'Affirmative, prae habitis tamen juratis informationibus, ut supra, in responsione ad II. et III.'² (the regulations already quoted).

¹ 'II. An ii, qui in aliqua Familia Religiosa primam tantum professionem emiserant ante publicationem Decreti, valide admitti possint ad alteram professionem, scilicet solemnem in Ordinibus Regularibus, et perpetuam in ceteris Institutis, si in decreto comprehensi fuerint.'

'Ad II. Affirmative; sed Superiores sub gravi obligatione tenentur: a) opportunas, *secretas juratasque* informationes exquirere Superiorum Seminariorum vel Collegiorum, vel Institutum religiosi a quo, circa veras causas exitus alumnorum, de quibus agitur; b) moraliter aliunde certos fieri et de bonis eorum religiosi moribus, et de solidae vocationis argumentis, et, si agatur de clericis candidatis, etiam de idoneitate litteraria,' etc. (*Acta Apost. Sedis*, vol. ii. n. 6, pp. 231-2.)

² Ibid.

Dismissal for any mental or moral defect will certainly bring the postulant under the law. Does the rule apply equally to dismissal for ill-health? It is certain, as already stated, that the impediment does not exist if, as often happens, the candidate is put off for a time, not formally dismissed: and the fact suggests the course that Superiors in future should pursue in cases of the kind. Even outside these circumstances, the probability seems to be that the case of dismissal for ill-health does not come under the law. The main aim and object of the Decree, it will hardly be denied, is to secure moral and intellectual, not mere physical, fitness. It will be remembered, for instance, that according to the Roman replies already given Superiors are bound to assure themselves of the moral character of the candidates and, in case of clerical postulants, of their literary qualifications; but that there is not a word said about the candidate's health. The phrase *quacumque ratione* is, we grant, wide enough to cover all possible motives for dismissal, ill-health included; but general expressions of this kind must, after all, be interpreted in the light of evidence derived from other sources. But though the negative opinion be the more probable, it is by no means certain; and, in view of the importance of the issues at stake, there can be no doubt that, in the existing state of the law, an application for special faculties is to be recommended if the dismissal has already taken place. The replies given, when viewed in connexion with the opinions previously expressed by eminent canonists, show the absolute futility of speculation. No matter how probable a view may seem, a positive decision to the contrary may at any moment upset our best laid scheme of probabilities.¹

IV. On the fourth section we have little to say. It merely prescribes that the regulations already laid down will apply to a re-admission into the same Order from

¹ P. Vermeersch (*Periodica*, t. 5, p. 54), maintains that the law does not apply to the case. M. Besson (*loc. cit.*, p. 272), is not inclined to agree.

It may be remembered that, according to the Constitution *Conditae a Christo*, bad health is never a sufficient reason for dismissing a nun with perpetual vows, nor even a nun with temporary vows, if the Superiors knew of it before the profession. (n. 199.)

which the dismissal took place. The case contemplated is one of an Order divided into several provinces. But when the Order consists of various independent houses, there seems to be no reason for denying that the same principles hold: that, in other words, a nun dismissed from one house of such an Order or Congregation will be ineligible for admission into the same house, or into any other belonging to the same Order. From the fact that no mention is made of a dispensation in this connexion, some are inclined to infer that a nun dispensed from her vows may lawfully and validly be received back into the Order she has left. In theory the view is certainly probable. In practice much will depend on the terms of the dispensation granted, for the Holy See has reserved to itself power to make provision for certain cases ('*absque speciali venia Sedis Apostolicæ*'), and it is from the Holy See that the special dispensation in the case will emanate.

Whether all these rules apply to diocesan congregations, and to communities living under a rule approved by the Holy See but without religious vows, has not been finally settled. All the authorities, as far as we can see, are on the negative side.¹ But it is well to remember that a decision to the contrary is always possible, and that those who are in charge of such communities should, therefore, to avoid possible trouble later on, accommodate themselves to the recent Decree, and carry out its principles until a final decision has been given.²

It only remains for us to say, in explanation of our rather lengthy discussion of the questions sent us, that since the law binds '*sub poena nullitatis professionis*,' and since its penalties are, therefore, incurred even by those who have no knowledge of its provisions, it is most important that it should be fully understood by the Superiors of religious Orders as well as by all who have charge of educational establishments, religious or otherwise. It was promulgated

¹ Vermeersch, *loc. cit.*, p. 99; Gennari, *Questioni Canoniche*, n. 53; Besson, *loc. cit.*, p. 269, etc.

² Cf. the decision, given in the *Acta Apost. Sedis* (vol. ii. n. 11, p. 450), extending the regulations governing studies to congregations '*quibus alumni ligantur simplici promissione perseverantiæ.*'

on February 15, 1910, and binds all whose final vows of profession had not been made at that date, no matter when their novitiate commenced.¹

M. J. O'DONNELL.

LITURGY

GENERAL DECREE ON MEDAL-SCAPULARS

AMONG the documents published in the current issue of the I. E. RECORD will be found a Decree of the Congregation of the Holy Office on the subject of Medal-Scapulars. Up to this there has been no *general* regulation on the matter, and whatever power certain priests possessed for blessing Medals to serve as substitutes for Scapulars was derived from private or individual Indults. The tenor of these Indults and the method of procuring them have been already explained.² It will now be useful to analyse the terms of the present Decree and to point out the chief changes which it introduces into the legislation on Scapulars hitherto existing. There can be no doubt that while the new regulation may appear to be rather drastic the substitution of Medals for Scapulars will have its own advantage. The following paragraphs will contain all that need be known for the guidance of priests in blessing these Medal-Scapulars.³

1°. For the future all persons will be free to wear Medals in place of the Scapulars in which they have been *already enrolled*.

2°. The Medals must be *specially* blessed for this purpose, and each person may use as many Medals as there are Scapulars or he may content himself with only one Medal for all, provided that this Medal receives as many blessings as there are Scapulars which it is designed to replace.

¹ Cf. : ' I. An postulantes ad Novitiatum admissi ante publicationem decreti et in ipso comprehensi, valide ad professionem admitti queant, absque venia Apostolicæ Sedis.'

' Ad I. : Negative ' (*Acta Apost. Sedis*, vol. ii. n. 6, pp. 231-2). And similar replies had been already given. (*Ibid.*, n. 1, p. 36).

² Cf. I. E. RECORD,

³ Cf. *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, Février, 1911.

3°. These blessings are given by a simple sign of the Cross. There is no form of words required. Where a Medal is intended to replace four or five Scapulars it would at all events be *safer* to impart the requisite number of blessings by making as many distinct signs of the Cross. The terms of the Decree in regard to this point leave some doubt as to whether the different blessings may not be given by one sign of the Cross made by a priest who intends by this single act to impart all the blessings. If one Medal be used for two or more Scapulars, then one priest may bless it for one Scapular and another priest may bless the same Medal for a different Scapular. The blessings are not to be given to Medals for Scapulars that one has not already lawfully received and been enrolled in. It must be understood that the Medal is merely intended to dispense with the *wearing* of the Scapular only. Hence it is that, the imposition of the Scapular being necessarily anterior to the blessing of the Medal, a priest is not at liberty to bless a number of Medals at once and keep them in reserve for subsequent distribution. For it might happen in this case that the persons who afterwards received the Medals were not enrolled when the latter were blessed.

4°. Every priest can bless Medals for all Scapulars for which he has received faculties and for these only. The power, then, of blessing the Medals is co-extensive with the faculty for enrolling in the Scapulars and subject to the same restrictions and limitations. In other words, wherever and whenever a priest can enroll in a certain Scapular in the same precise circumstances he is entitled to bless a Medal to take the place of that Scapular. Nothing, however, is changed as regards the ordinary rules that govern the imposition of Scapulars and the faculties for enrolment.

5°. The Decree sets forth an exact description of the Medal to be used. It must have the Image of our Blessed Saviour pointing out His Sacred Heart on the obverse, and an Image of the Blessed Virgin on the reverse, side. The material is not specified except that it be of metal. It should, therefore, conform to the general laws for blessed objects.

6°. The Medal may replace almost all Scapulars approved

by the Holy See. The Scapular of the Third Order of St. Francis appears to be excepted.¹

7°. The Decree sets at rest the doubt about the Sabbatine Privilege. It is decided that this Indulgence, whatever it has been, still remains the same for the wearing of the Medal.

8°. The Medal must be worn or carried becomingly about the person. It may be attached to the neck by a cord, or to any part of the clothes. The word *deferre* seems to indicate that the Medal should be always worn except perhaps when it is laid aside for a few moments now and again. So that it would not be safe to put it aside during the night.

9°. The Decree was published in the *Acta Apostolicæ Sedis* on January 16, 1911, and, therefore, takes effect from this date.

Supplementary to the Decree itself are three *Declarationes* setting forth the bearing of the new regulation upon the Special Indults already granted for blessing the Medals. In the first place, Medals already blessed—that is, before January 17, 1911—are not affected by the recent Decree, but are governed by the tenor of the Special Indults granting the power to bless them. This applies apparently to those actually blessed by priests having the necessary faculties even though not actually *distributed*.²

Next, all Special Indults cease after the five years for which they were issued have expired. In the meantime the Medals may be blessed in accordance with the conditions specified in the Decree under consideration. It is, of course, unnecessary to say that if any priest, who got these Special Indults, happens to have, from the recognized source, authority to invest in Scapulars, he has *eo ipso* power to bless Medals to take the place of these.

Lastly, all power to subdelegate faculties in virtue of these Special Indults hereby ceases with the issue of the Decree under notice.

P. MORRISROE.

¹ Cf. *N. R. Théologique*, p. 95.

² Cf. Besson, *loc. cit.*, p. 99.

DOCUMENTS

ADDRESS OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS X. TO THE
FRANCISCAN FATHERS

SERMO

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI PII PP. X. AD PP. FRANCISCALES
RESPONSIO, IN AUDIENTIA HABITA IV IDUS NOVEMBRIS

Conspectus vester, dilecti Filii, verba quibus egregios animi sensus effudistis, pietatis vestrae in communem Patrem significatio alte Nos permoverunt et magnopere delectarunt. Haec autem eo Nobis gratiora contingunt, quod a religiosis eius ordinis viris proficiscantur, quorum instituta, traditiones, historia, imperitura sunt monumenta fervidi erga Ecclesiam amoris et in-violati obsequii. Haeret namque animo vis et constantia qua Francisci Patris alumni, virtutis doctrinaeque laude florentes et ad augendum beatorum caelitem numerum fere destinati, cum Apostolica Sede sentire et facere eiusque iura tueri nunquam destiterunt, ne cum ipso quidem periculo capitis. Addit laetitiae causam cogitatio quod huiusmodi caritatis ostensio erga Nos atque hanc Apostolicam Sedem erumpat exeunte saeculo VII. ab instituto Ordine vestro, quum nempe Nos, non modo benevolentis memorisque animi sensus vobis exploratos fecimus, beneficia impertientes, quorum dispensatores a divina Providentia constituti sumus, verum etiam id egimus, ut inter Filios et communem Patrem caritatis nexus arctius obstringerentur.

Nunc vero gratiae vobis referendae sollicitos efficit prona et alacris voluntas, qua monita Nostra excepistis, ut vos omnes censeritis unius eiusdemque Patris Francisci filios, absque ullo discrimine, in tres quidem familias distinctos, verum unius disciplinae sectatores, atque ita coniunctos, ut sitis *cor unum et anima una*; communis inter vos agatur causa; eadem sint omnibus rationes constitutae; atque ita mundo exemplum exhibeatis eius concordiae, quae a divina tantum gratia derivatur.

Nec minus grate vos intuemur ea succensos caritate, qua Franciscus, bonum Christi odorem late diffundere atque ad eius exemplum *omnibus omnia factos*, nullam sacri ministerii civilisque cultus provinciam vobis alienam putare. Quotidianus enim vos urget labor et annuntiandi verbi divini et excolendarum gentium

non modo civilium, sed etiam humanitatis omnis expertium, quae adhuc *in tenebris et umbra mortis sedent*; maxime vero misericordiae opera exercendi in publicis custodiis, in valetudinariis, ad aegrotantium corpora reficienda et ad inquinatos vitiis animos revocandos.

Gratiae denique vobis persolvantur ob virilem in decertando pro iustitia et veritate constantiam; cui dimicationi modo faces admoverunt artes malignae et potentia coniuratorum contra Christum et Ecclesiam, reputantium sese nobiscum egisse praeclare, quod nos vivere sinant, impendente cervicibus iniquarum gladio legum. Pergite, dilecti Filii, pugnare pro viribus, neve animum despondeatis, quod res ad inimicorum voluntatem aliquandiu fluant. Alias fregit proiecitque vires Ecclesia, ut iam vereri non liceat, ne tandem aliquando, Dei suffulti praesidio, unoque fidei et caritatis obstricti vinculo, simus victoriam consequuturi.

Ad vos autem singulari quadam sollicitudine patet os Nostrum, dilecti iuvenes, qui quasi flosculi e triplici religiosa familia deducti Urbem petivistis, ornaturi animum virtute doctrinaque mentem, ut sanctitatis effluvia lucemque sapientiae per omnes terrarum orbis plagas circumferatis.

Vos Francisci disciplinam profitentes optimam sane partem eligistis, qua genuinam christianae perfectionis imagines possitis in vitae usum deducere, effectique veri Christi discipuli, non solum communia officia, sed etiam evangelica vivendi praecepta tueri. Vos estis christianae reipublicae selecti cives, qui divini Magistri verba et exempla serio accipientes, Deum, quo decet loco, in sua ipsorum anima vitaeque collocarunt; qui religionem, quod aequissimum est, maximum et primum negotium esse intellexerunt; qui sempiternam saltuem tanti fecerunt, quanti Christus quum dixit: *Porro unum est necessarium*; qui, externis fluxisque bonis abdicatis, ut praecipuum vitae finem unice spectarent, a mundanis rebus ad rerum omnium Conditorem animum avocarunt; qui denique iam non sibi vivere constituerunt, sed Christo Iesu.

Quia vero virtutum omnium exemplar est absolutissimum Christus, idcirco student Eius formam, quoad possunt, in se ipsi transferre. Quare similitudinem Eius conantur arripere, illius crucem amplexi et consepulti cum Ipso, uni Deo viventes, fidei et obedientiae iugo mentem animumque mancipantes, carnem crucifigentes ut dominetur spiritus, abstinentia, vigiliis, afflictationibus adimplentes *ea quae desunt passionum Christi*

—*semper mortificationem Iesu in corpore . . . circumferentes*, ita ut unicuique liceat affirmare cum Paulo : *Vivo ego, iam non ego ; vivit vero in me Christus*. Nec enim horum os aliud spirat nisi Christum, nec nisi propter Ipsum palpitant praecordia ; in Ipso toti vivunt, moventur et sunt ; quo fit ut vita praesens sit iisdem instar tirocinii et praeparationis ad longe meliorem, quam prospicientes, mortem habent loco lucri, utpote quae perficiet consumabitque coniunctionem cum Illo, qui fuit ipsorum vita, secundum illud memorati Apostoli : *Mihi vivere Christus est et mori lucrum*.

Sed qui Christum imitari vult, is debet, non solum *facere*, sed etiam *docere*. Atque ad hoc nempe, dilecti iuvenes, huc estis vocati, ut eam doctrinae copiam vobis comparetis, quae valide obiici possit falsi nominis scientiae, fidei pariter ac rationi infensae, et nihilominus affectanti imperium in scholis. Est autem veri nominis scientia illa dumtaxat, quae a SS. Litteris derivatur et a traditionibus ab Ecclesia receptis atque approbatis. Itaque, sive de Fidei principiis agatur, sive de regula morum, sive de legibus disciplinae, sermo vester ne sit hominis unquam, sed Ecclesiae. Neve patiamini imminutionem fieri ullam veritatis aut legis ab Ecclesia propositae cuius doctrina plena est, integra, purissima.

Quae quidem doctrinae integritas ac puritas nunquam erit commendata satis. Impugnatis enim acerrime, ut hodie fit, sacris traditionibus, non desunt qui opportunum, aut etiam necessarium ducant, ut Ecclesia interdum a veteri doctrinae severitate recedat. At obiurgent licet Ecclesiam propositi tenacem in custodiendis veris et institutis, quae profanae sapientiae non arident ; nitantur antiquae Matri suadere ut modernistarum recipiat aliqua capita ; ut cedat, resque pro opportunitate amice componat ; ut sinat haud spernendos homines tranquille vivere, quorum opiniones, ut aiunt, sunt *irreformabiles*, quorum ab ingenio civitas et ipsa Ecclesia multum opis et gloriae exspectare possint. Haec et similia mussitent prudentiores isti viri. Vos, dilecti Filii, verbis Pauli compellabimus ad Timotheum conversis : *Tu autem, o homo Dei, haec fuge :—certa bonum certamen fidei—bonum depositum custodi per Spiritum Sanctum qui est in nobis. Formam habe sanorum verborum quae a me audisti in fide*. Atque etiamsi postuletur a vobis, ut utilium conventionum gratia aut spe convertendae multitudinis ad causam Religionis, de doctrina gratificemini aliquid corruptis mundi opinionibus, unusquisque vestrum sibi dicta putet quae Apostolus discipulo

suo : *Praeceptio tibi coram Deo, qui vivificat omnia et coram Iesu Christo, qui reddidit sub Pontio Pilato bonam confessionem, ut serves mandatum sine macula irreprehensibile usque in adventum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi.* Quando apud homines in pretio esse cessabit incorruptibilis haec doctrina, quando purae et intaminatae veritatis regnum desierit in mundo, tunc Deus excitabit iterum Filium Suum, *quem suis temporibus ostendet beatus et solus potens Rex regum.* Interim nostrum est, qui Eius legatione fungimur, depositum integre inviolateque servare usque ad adventum Domini ultimum, cum Hilario sancto exclamantes : 'Melius est mihi in hoc saeculo mori, quam, alicuius potentia dominante, castam veritatis corrumpere virginitatem.'

Vos autem, dilecti Filii, vitae sanctitatem cum doctrinae puritate atque integritate coniunctam servabitis, si Reginae Ordinis vestri, Deiparae labis nesciae cultum assidui fovebitis. Per Ipsam enim, quae est 'speculum iustitiae et sedes sapientiae,' omnia nos habere voluit Omnipotens. Magi, quum se Bethleem contulerunt ut adorarent Iesum, *intrantes domum invenerunt Puerum cum Maria Matre Eius.* Iam Ecclesia domus est, quam subeunt Iesus et Maria occurrunt. Ecquid enim christianus est cultus nisi Mariae Filii religio? Si autem quod Deus coniunxit separari non potest, profecto Iesum non invenias nisi cum Maria et per Mariam. Quam iure quidem santi viri appellarunt 'ostensorium vivens.' Ipsa enim nobis in hac valle lacrimarum constitutis viam salutis, Iesum, sedula ostendit; Ipsa clemens et pia nostras Filio porigit preces, quibus ad Eam quotidie clamamus: 'Iesum benedictum fructum ventris tui nobis post hoc exilium ostende.'—Pergat caeli Regina et advocata nostra Maria materno nobiscum fungi munere, ac serius ocus carne exutis det Iesum intueri, non tremendae maiestatis Regem ac severissimum iudicem, sed Servatorem propitium, amicum serenum, misericordem fratrem. Huius auspicem gratiae et singularis Nostrae benevolentiae testem, tibi dilecte Fili Noster Cardinalis, vobis ministri generales, moderatores, magistri, alumni quotquot adestis, ceterisque fratribus vestri Ordinis universis Apostolicam Benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

THE NEW DOMINICAN HOUSE IN ROME

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

COMMENDATUR NOVUM DOMINICIANAE FAMILIAE IN URBE INSTITUTUM, EIQUE SANCTISSIMUM ASSERVANDI FACULTAS PERPETUO TRIBUITUR

PIUS PP. X.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Perillustrem Fratrum Praedicatorum familiam, tot virorum non minus sanctitate, quam doctrina praestantium altricem, ex more institutoque Romanorum Pontificum propensa voluntate libentissime prosequimur et honestamus. Huic enim inclyto Ordini, quem unus ex insignioribus Ecclesiae Sanctis, in fidei subsidium a Domino datus, condidit, summae erit semper gloriae Aquinatem Doctorem inter suos sodales adnumerare, clarissimum scholarum lumen, de quo merito dictum est, tot miracula patravisse, quot sapientes scripserit articulos. Neque minor laus Dominiciano coetui hoc quidem tribuitur, quod ipse divini verbi praeconium, e suo praescripto, peragendo, catholicam veritatem apud fideles integre servare, et apud ethnicos longe lateque propagare studet et contendit. Laeto igitur iucundoque accepimus animo, eiusdem Ordinis Moderatores peramplam in hac Alma Urbe Nostra nuper extruendam curavisse domum, seu Pontificium Collegium cuiusvis nationis ephebos complectens, cui inditum est *Angelico* nomen. Et nihil antiquius profecto habemus, quam ut ibi iuvenes, se tam gloriosae familiae devovere cupientes, sive sacris profanisque excolantur disciplinis, sive religionis tirocinium ponant. Quae cum ita sint, dilectum filium Hyacinthum Mariam Cormier, supremum Praedicatorum Ordinis Magistrum, sui voti compotem facientes, non modo hoc novum Institutum eiusque supra commendatos fines Auctoritate Nostra comprobamus, sed ut ei omnia bona, fausta ac felicia succedant, Deum adprecamur, eique spirituale a Nobis petitum privilegium peramanter impertimur. Quare praesentium tenore Apostolica Auctoritate Nostra facultatem perpetuo duraturam facimus, cuius vi tum in interiore praedictae domus sacello, tum in ei adnexo publico templo, dummodo in utraque aede ter saltem in hebdomada sacrum fiat, Sacramentum Augustum asservari licite possit ac valeat. Praecipimus tamen, ut ante tabernaculum, in quo Sanctissimum asservari solet, lampas diu noctuque continenter luceat, ut eiusdem tabernaculi clavis fideliter diligenterque custodienda, penes aedituum, seu Cappellanum, assidue maneat,

denique ut alia omnia accurate serventur, quae pro custodia et cultu Sanctissimi Eucharistiae Sacramenti ex Ecclesiae legibus servanda praescribuntur. Non obstantibus contrariis quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die XIV Iunii MDCCCX, Pontificatus Nostri anno septimo.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *a Secretis Status*.

L. ✠ S.

THE ARCHCONFRATERNITY OF OUR LADY OF LOURDES

ERECTIO IN ARCHICONFRATERNITATEM SOCIETATIS TITULO B. MARIAE VIRGINIS LAPURDENSIS, IN ECCLESIA FRATRUM MINORUM CAPULATORUM, MANILAE EXISTENTIS

PIUS PP. X.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Maniliensium Archiepiscopus, refert ad Nos iam inde ab anno MDCCCLXXX, cura Fratrum Minorum Capulatorum, fuisse in Philippinas Insulas erga Lapurdensem Virginem devotionem invectam. Ante illud tempus exiguus in iisdem Insulis erat fidelium numerus, qui mirandi thaumaturgae Virginis facinora norant, nondum enim ad disitas illas oras celeberrimi Sanctuarii Lapurdensis fama pervenerat. Sed anno MDCCCLXXXIII, annuente Archiepiscopo, in Ecclesia Fratrum Minorum Capulatorum, Manilae, Confraternitas sub titulo Nostrae Dominae Lapurdensis canonice primum erecta est. Haec autem Societas, favente Domino, tam magna brevi suscepit incrementa, tantaque sodalium frequentia floruit, ut modo inter praecipuas adnumeretur Insularum Philippinarum Sodalitates. Nunc autem cum super enunciatus Manilensis Archiepiscopus enixas nobis preces adhibeat, ut eandem Societatem, tot tantisque nominibus de catholica re iisdem in Insulis optime meritam, Archisodalitatis titulo ac privilegiis de Nostra benignitate cohonestare dignemur: Nos, quibus nihil antiquius est, quam ut fidelium devotio erga Lapurdensem Virginem, gratiarum omnium sequestram, magis ac magis amplificetur, optatis his annuendum libenti quidem animo existimamus. Quae cum ita sint, Apostolica Nostra Auctoritate, praesentium vi, perpetuumque in modum Societatem sub titulo Dominae Nostrae Lapurdensis, in Ecclesia Fratrum Minorum Capulatorum civitatis Manilensis canonice institutam, in Archiconfraternitatem erigimus, evehimus atque constituimus, et

consuetis honoribus et privilegiis ornamus. Archisodalitatis autem sic per nos erectae Moderatori atque Officialibus praesentibus et futuris, similiter Auctoritate Nostra per praesentes perpetuo concedimus, ut ipsi alias Societates eiusdem nominis atque instituti, intra fines Insularum Philippinarum canonice existentes, servatis forma Constitutionis Clementis PP. VIII. Praedecessoris Nostri rec. mem. aliisque Apostolicis Ordinationibus desuper editis, sibi aggregare, illisque omnes et singulas indulgentias, peccatorum remissiones ac poenitentiarum relaxationes eidem Archisodalitati a Sede Apostolica concessas, quae aliis sint communicabiles, communicare licite possint ac valeant. Decernentes praesentes litteras firmas, validas et efficaces semper existere et fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri et obtinere, illisque ad quos spectat et spectare poterit in omnibus et per omnia plenissime suffragari, sicque in praemissis per quoscumque Iudices ordinarios et delegatos iudicari et definiri debere irritumque esse atque inane, si secus super his a quoquam, quavis auctoritate, scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari. Non obstantibus contrariis quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die XXVII Augusti MDCCCX, Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *a Secretis Status.*

L. ✠ S.

WREATHS MADE OF WOOD OR METAL ON THE ALTAR.

S. CONGREGATIO RITUUM

ORDINIS FRATRUM MINORUM

DE VETITO USU CORONIDUM, SIVE EX LIGNO SIVO EX METALLO, IN
ALTARIBUS

Hodiernus S. Montis Alverniae Superior cum suo Directorio, de consensu Rm̃i Procuratoris Generalis Ordinis Minorum, Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi ea quae sequuntur humiliter exposuit.

Multis in Ecclesiis, ad maiorem Altarium munditiam et ne rugosae sed magis extensae eorumdem mappae servarentur, usus invaluit, innumeris adhinc annis, Coronidum, variis materiis confectarum, lignea non exclusa. Hae coronides lignea ab Altaribus removebantur, iuxta Episcoporum Caeremoniale (lib. I, cap. 12, n. 11), dum festivis diebus Sacra Solemnia sive Missae sive Vesperae celebrabantur. Talem agendi rationem esse

consonam supradicti Caeremonialis praescriptionibus, eruitur etiam ex novissimo Ordinis Minorum Caeremoniali, die 4 Octobris 1908 edito et rite a S. Sede approbato (lib. I, part 2, cap. et art. 1), in quo agitur de non apponendis Altaribus ligneis Corondibus iuxta Caeremoniale Episcoporum supradictum, cum de ornatu Altarium in Vesperis et Missis solemnibus sermo est. Quum autem Sacra Rituum Congregatio ad dubium super licitate talium corollarum, die 24 Februarii 1908 respondisset his generalibus verbis: *negative iuxta Caeremoniale Episcoporum Lib. I, cap. 12, n. 11 'Nullae tamen coronides lignae,'* etc.; atque haec responsio aliquam attulerit dubietatem; idem Orator ab ipsa Sacra Congregatione sequentium dubiorum solutionem reverenter postulavit:

I. Utrum, remotis ab Altaribus Coronidibus ligneis dum Sacra Solemnia, ut supra, peraguntur, tolerari et permitti possint aliis temporibus, attenta praesertim antiquissima consuetudine?

II. Quatenus negative, utrum adhiberi possint ex metallo decenti coopertae, vel saltem de metallo totaliter confectae?

Et Sacra Rituum Congregatio, exquisito, Commissionis Liturgicae suffragio, omnibus accurate perpensis, respondendum censuit:

Ad I. et II. Negative.

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 13 Maii 1910.

FR. S. CARD. MARTINELLI, *Praefectus.*

✠ PETRUS LA FONTAINE, *Episc. Charystien., Secretarius.*

L. ✠ S.

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS X. TO CARDINAL AGUIRRE Y GARCIA, ARCHBISHOP OF TOLEDO

AD GREGORIUM M. CARD. AGUIRRE Y GARCIA, ARCHIEPISCOPUM TOLETANUM, IOSEPHUM M. CARD. MARTIN DE HERRERA Y DE LA IGLESIA, ARCHIEPISCOPUM COMPOSTELLANUM, CETEROSQUE HISPANIAE ARCHIEPISCOPOS ET EPISCOPOS, OB LITTERAS PIETATIS PLENAS BEATISSIMO PATRI INSCRIPTAS

Dilecti Filii Nostri ac Venerabiles Fratres, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.—Communes litterae quas nuper ad Nos dedistis, studium redolent in Nos vestrum, haud ignotum quidem Nobis sed tamen gratum atque optatum. Moerentem quippe opportuno studetis solatio relevare ipsi vos, Dilecti Filii Nostri ac Venerabiles Fratres, quibus assiduas inter sollicitudines iam diu volvitur actas. Vestri pene obliti Nostrique tantum memores

visi estis, quum, quae in caput Nostrum, in quicquid est catholicis carum ac sacrum, non multis ante diebus, in ipsa luce Urbis congestae sunt, compellationes maledicas ac probrosas ita exhorruistis, ut eas nonnisi acerbissime tuleritis. Leniit sane aegritudinem Nostram mira haec conspiratio pietatis, cui pietas concinuit omnium quotquot sunt fusi per orbem fidelium; vobisque omnibus, officii memores, meritam gratiam et agimus et habemus. Ceterum quaecumque et Nobis et vobis tristia afferat dies, ne frangant animum, neve obliviscamur eius corporis atque eius capitis membra nos esse, qui proposito sibi gaudio, sustinuit crucem. Cui quidem prompto alacrique animo perferendae, auxilio sit Apostolica Benedictio, quam coelestium munerum auspicem Nostraeque testem benevolentiae, vobis, Dilecti Filii Nostri ac Venerabiles Fratres, Cleris populisque in quos vestrae evigilant curae, amantissime in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum die XXVI Octobris MDMX, Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

PIUS PP. X.

MEDAL IN PLACE OF SCAPULARS

I.

S. CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII

DE METALLICO NUMISMATE PRO LUBITU FIDELIUM SACRIS
SCAPULARIBUS EX PANNO SUFFICIENDO

DECRETUM

Cum sacra, quae vocant, scapularia ad fidelium devotionem fovendam sanctiorisque vitae proposita in eis excitanda maxime conferre compertum sit, ut pius eis nomen dandi mos in dies magis invalescat, SS^{ms} D. N. D. Pius divina providentia PP. X., etsi vehementer exoptet ut eadem, quo hucusque modo consueverunt, fideles deferre prosequantur, plurium tamen ad Se delatis votis ex animo obsecundans, praehabito E^morum Patrum Cardinalium Inquisitorum Generalium suffragio, in Audientia R. P. D. Adessori huius Supremae Sacrae Congregationis Sancti Officii, die 16 Decembris anni currentis, impertita, benigne decernere dignatus est :

Omnibus fidelibus, tam uni quam pluribus veri nominis atque a Sancta Sede probatis scapularibus (exceptis quae Tertiorum Ordinum sunt propria), per regularem, ut aiunt, impositionem iam adscriptis aut in posterum adscribendis, licere posthac pro ipsis, sive uno sive pluribus, scapularibus ex panno, unicum

numisma ex metallo seu ad collum seu aliter, decenter tamen super propriam personam, deferre, quo, servatis propriis cuiusque eorum legibus, favores omnes spirituales (*sabbatino*, quod dicunt, scapularis B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo *privilegio* non excepto) omnesque indulgentias singulis adnexas participare ac lucrari possint ac valeant;

Huius numismatis partem rectam, SS̃ni D. N. I. C. suum sacratissimum Cor ostendentis, aversam, B̃ñae Virginis Mariae effigiem referre debere;

Idem benedictum esse oportere tot distinctis benedictionibus quot sunt scapularia regulariter imposita, queis, pro lubitu petentium, suffici velit;

Singulas has, demum benedictiones impertiri posse *unico crucis signo*, vel in ipso adscriptionis actu, statim post absolutam regularem scapularis impositionem, vel etiam serius, pro petentium opportunitate, non interest an servato vel non diversarum adscriptionem ordine, nec quanto post temporis ab ipsis, a quovis Sacerdote, etiam ab adscribente distincto, qui respectiva scapularia benedicendi sive ordinaria sive delegata facultate polleat, firmis ceteroquin primitivae facultatis limitibus, clausulis et conditionibus.

Contrariis quibuscumque, etiam specialissima mentione dignis, non obstantibus.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus S. Officii, die 16 Decembris, 1910.

ALOISIUS GIAMBENE,

Substitutus pro Indulgentiis.

L. ✠ S.

II.

AD DECRETUM S. CONGREGATIONIS S. OFFICII DE METALLICO NUMISMATE SACRIS SCAPULARIBUS SUFFICIENDO

DECLARATIONES

Circa numismata hucusque ad finem, de quo supra, benedicta, et circa facultatem ea benedicendi a SS̃ño Dño nostro, directe, vel per aliquod S. Sedis Officium, aut aliter quomodo-libet iam concessam, Idem SS̃nus mentem Suam aperuit, et quae sequuntur adamussim servanda mandavit:

1. Numismata a facultatem habentibus rite iam benedicta, etiam in posterum scapularium loco gestari poterunt, eo modo et sub iis conditionibus, quibus constitit factam esse potestatem;

2. Sacerdotes omnes, saeculares vel regulares, etiam conspicua fulgentes dignitate, ne amplius numismata sic benedicendi utantur facultate, quinquennio ab illa obtenta transacto.

Poterunt interea, etiamsi scapularia respective benedicendi non polleant facultate, numismata ubilibet benedicere; ea tamen lege, ut sive quod ad statutas eorum attinet imagines, sive quod ceteras respicit conditiones, praescriptionibus in supra relato Decreto contentis omnino se conforment;

3. Qui porro subdelegandi praediti erant facultate, hac ipsa Decreti et Declarationum promulgatione, se illa noverint excidisse; satis enim per idem Decretum iam spirituali fidelium emolumento provisum est.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus S. Officii, die 16 Decembris 1910.

ALOISIUS GIAMBENE,
Substitutus pro Indulgentiis.

L. ✠ S.

EXCOMMUNICATION OF THREE ENGLISH PRIESTS

MOTU PROPRIO

SACERDOTES ARNOLDUS HARRIS MATHEW

HERBERTUS IGNATIUS BEALE ET ARTHURUS GUILIELMUS HOWARTH
NOMINATIM EXCOMMUNICANTUR

Gravi iamdiu scandalo maximo animi moerore, vobis esse novimus sacerdotes HERBERTUM IGNATIUM BEALE et ARTHURUM GUILIELMUM HOWARTH e clero Nottinghamensi qui, quae sunt non quae Iesu Christi quaerentes, et aestu ambitionis abrepti, postquam penes acatholicos homines Episcopatus honore augeri non semel pertentaverint, eo temeritatis novissime progressi sunt ut, voti compotes facti, Episcopalem consecrationem se recepisse Nobis arroganter nunciarint. Nec eorum nuncii authenticum defuit testimonium; nam qui sacrilegi huius facinoris princeps auctor fuit, pseudo-episcopus quidam ARNOLDUS HARRIS MATHEW, litteris tumoris plenis ad Nos datis, illud plane confirmare veritus non est. Qui quidem insuper Archiepiscopi Anglo-Catholici Londinensis titulum sibi arrogare non dubitavit.

Ad vos igitur, primum, Dilecti Filii, de quorum religiosa et devota erga Nos voluntate semper et illustria testimonia excepimus, animum et sollicitudinem Nostram convertentes, vehementer hortamur in Domino ut ab eorum fraudibus et insidiis sedulo caveatis.

Dein vero, ne muneri Nostro deesse videamur, Decessorum Nostrorum exemplis inhaerentes, praefatam consecrationem illegitimam, sacrilegam atque omnino contra huius Sanctae Sedis mandata Sacrorumque Canonum sanctionem factam edicimus.

Supra nominatos, demum, sacerdotes ARNOLDUM HARRIS MATHEW, HERBERTUM IGNATIUM BEALE et ARTHURUM GUILLELMUM HOWARTH, ceterosque omnes qui nefario huic crimini operam, consilium, consensum praeberunt, auctoritate Omnipotentis Dei, excommunicamus anathematizamus atque ab Ecclesiae communione segregatos ac prorsus schismaticos habendos et a Catholicis universis et praesertim a vobis vitandos esse praecipimus et solemniter declaramus.

Quam acrem quidem sed omnino necessariam medicinam adhibentes, vos pariter, Dilecti Filii, adhortamur ut fervidas preces vestras Nostris adiiciatis, Deum obsecrantes ut hos infeliciter errantes ad Christi ovile et ad salutis portum misericorditer dignetur reducere.

Quod ut efficacius, Deo adiuvante, consequi possitis, Apostolicam benedictionem vobis ex animo impertimur.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die XI Februarii MCMXI, Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

PIVS PAPA X.

RELAXATION OF LAW OF ABSTINENCE IN SCOTLAND

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

LEX ABSTINENTIAE RELAXATUR PRO SCOTIAE REGNI FIDELIBUS

PIUS PP. X.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Benigna Mater Ecclesia, dum suis ipsius filiis abstinentias ac ieiunia proponit, quo aeternae gloriae vitam facilius consequantur, harum tamen legum onera, ne quando pro re ac tempore minus congruere videantur, minuit ac levat. Cum vero exploratum habeamus, Scotiae Regni fidelibus, utpote qui maxima ex parte operarii sint, et quotidie in arduis laboribus versentur, grave admodum esse, duos continuos dies carnibus abstinere, Nos votis omnium illius regionis Antistitum, quae Venerabilis Frater Iacobus Augustinus Archiepiscopus S. Andreae et Edimburgensis, atque in eadem Scotia Metropolitanus, suo fulta Nobis detulit suffragio, benigne exceptis abstinentiae normam libenti quidem animo relaxamus. Quare de Omnipotentis Dei misericordia ac BB. Petri et Pauli Apostolorum Eius auctoritate confisi, omnibus ac singulis Scotiae Regni fidelibus Apostolica Auctoritate Nostra praesentium tenore perpetuo concedimus et largimur, ut Quadragesima exclusa, in Sabbatis quatuor anni temporum, et in iis Vigiliis,

quae vel feriam sextam, vel alium abstinentiae diem immediate praecedant aut sequantur, carnibus vesci libere liciteque possint ac valeant. In contrarium facientibus non obstantibus quibuscumque. Decernentes praesentes Nostras Litteras firmas, validas atque efficaces semper existere et fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri et obtinere, illisque ad quos spectat et in posterum spectabit, in omnibus et per omnia plenissime suffragari, sicque in praemissis per quoscumque iudices ordinarios vel delegatos iudicari et definiri debere, atque irritum esse et inane, si secus super his a quoquam, quavis auctoritate, scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari.

Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die XXVII Ianuarii MCMXI, Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

L. ✠ S.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL,
a Secretis Status.

EXTENSION OF THE SODALITY OF PRAYER FOR THE
CONVERSION OF ENGLAND

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

DE PROPOSITO FINE PRECUM OPERUMQUE PRO REDITU AD ECCLESIAE
UNITATEM A SODALITATE PRINCIPE SULPICIANA ULTRA
BRITANNIAM PROFERENDO

PIUS PP. X.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Quoties animum subit cogitatio admotarum a Christo precum aeterno Patri, quae a Ioanne Apostolo referuntur in evangelio c. XVII, toties vehementer commovemur ac desiderio incendimur intuendae multitudinis credentium eo caritatis adductae ut iterum fiat *cor unum et anima una* (Act. ap. c. IV. 32). Haec fraterna coniunctio quam fuerit in votis divino Magistro, fusae primum pro apostolis ab Eo preces plane declarant: *Pater sanctae, conserva eos in nomine tuo quos dedisti mihi ut sint unum sicut et nos.* Verum non in solo apostolorum coetu consistere, sed ad omnes Christi asseclas debere hanc unitatem proferri, adiecta mox verba satis ostendunt: *Non pro eis autem rogo tantum, sed et pro eis qui credituri sunt per verbum eorum in me, ut omnes unum sint sicut tu, pater, in me et ego in te, ut et ipsi in nobis unum sint; ut credat mundus quia tu me misisti.* Quam denique arcta debeat esse huiusmodi coniunctio, ignitis hisce significat verbis: *ego in eis et tu in me, ut sint consummati in unum.*

Haec Nobiscum reputantes, quibus, licet indignis, demandata cura est confirmandi fratres pascendique agnos et oves, incredibilem hausimus laetitiam, quum a supremo moderatore Sulpicianae Congregationis Parisiensis eodemque praeside sodalitatis principis precum piorumque operum pro Britanniae reditu ad Fidei unitatem, plane consentaneos votis Nostris vidimus exhiberi supplices libellos duorum Patrum Cardinalium ac plurium sacrorum antistitum, qui, utrique, Canadensi eucharistico coetui adfuissent. Hi enim flagitabant ut memorata sodalitas a sa. me. decessore Nostro Leone XIII. sub patrocinio Beatae Mariae Virginis perdolentis, instituta Parisiis ad S. Sulpicii, Litteris apostolicis *Compertum est* die XIX mensis Augusti anno MDCCCXCVII, propositum sibi finem latius proferret, ita ut, non modo Britannia, sed regiones omnes, quae cum hac essent eiusdem linguae societate coniunctae, communi earum precationum beneficio fruerentur.

Ad hanc precum conspirationem augendam, praeter ipsam rem per se maxime optabilem, haud mediocriter Nos impulerunt et inclinatae per hos dies voluntates in reditum et auctoritates hominum sanctitate, doctrina, dignitate praestantium, qui, Pauli a Cruce eiusque recentis alumni Dominici a Matre Dei ardorem studiumque fecundissimum admirati, unitatis bonum, quaeque inde exspectandae sunt utilitates, modis omnibus, excitata praesertim in Deo exorando sollertia, maturandum esse censuerunt.

Quamobrem, auctoritate Nostra apostolica, vi praesentium Litterarum, Sodalitatem principem precum ac piorum operum pro reditu Britanniae ad unitatem Fidei, sub patrocinio B. M. Virginis perdolentis, in Sulpicianis aedibus a decessore Nostro Leone XIII. superius memoratis apostolicis Litteris constitutam, dum in reliquis sartam tectamque manere volumus, propositum sibi finem sic iubemus extendere, ut fundendis precibus, non Britanniae tantum filios, Nobis usque carissimos, complectatur, sed populos omnes qui anglica utantur lingua tamquam vernacula. Non obstantibus Constitutionibus et ordinationibus apostolicis ceterisque speciali licet atque individua mentione dignis contra facientibus quibusvis.

Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die II mensis Februarii anno MDCCCXCI, Pontificatus Nostri octavo

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL,
a Secretis Status.

**LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS X. TO THE DUKE OF
NORFOLK**

AD CLARISSIMUM VIRUM HENRICUM FITZALAN-HOWARD DUCEM
DE NORFOLK, OB TEMPLUM IN OPPIDO NORWICH EIUSDEM
PIETATE SUMPTIBUSQUE EXCITATUM

Dilecte Fili, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.—
Eximiae pietatis tuae hunc etiam amavimus fructum, templum
in oppido Norwich tua excitatum largitate, ac die festo Mariae
labris nesciae Deo dicandum. Pecuniae tuae nulla sane uberius
usura. Duplicem quippe assequutus es laudem, praestantis
scilicet cum in Deum tum etiam in civitatem caritatis. De
utroque enim optime meruisti, quum et dignitati sacrorum et
loci popularium inservieris commoditati. Quod quidem bene
merendi studium, perspectum iamdiu in te, utpote cum prae-
cellenti antiqui generis claritate haustum, et haud semel a
Decessore Nostro f. r. Leone XIII. iusta commendatione cele-
bratum, libet modo, novo edito testimonio, nova exornare laude.
Quo vero, Dilecte Fili, benevolentia in te Nostra cumulator fiat,
Apostolicam Benedictionem, divinorum munerum conciliatricem,
cum tibi tum perillustri familiae tuae amanter impertimus, id
etiam supplicii prece expetentes ut *maiestas Domini impleat
domum* quam aedificasti, et *aves ipsius erectae sint ad orationem
eius qui in loco isto oraverit.*

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die VIII Novembris MCMX,
Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

PIUS PP. X.

**LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS X. TO ARCHBISHOP
CHRISTIE OF OREGON AND BISHOPS OF HIS PROVINCE**

AD RR. PP. DD. ALEXANDRUM CHRISTIE, OREGONOPOLITANORUM
ARCHIEPISCOPUM, CETEROSQUE OREGONOPOLITANAE PROVIN-
CIAE EPISCOPOS, QUI MAGNUM PIETATIS TESTIMONIUM BEA-
TISSIMO PATRI PER LITTERAS EXHIBUERUNT

Venerabiles Fratres, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.
—Quem proximis communibus litteris declarastis conceptum
animo dolorem ob illatas nuper Nobis iniurias, et ceteri omnes,
libet nuntiare, vobiscum, Venerabiles Fratres, declararunt qui
catholicis, qua late patet orbis accensentur. Mira haec con-
spiratio pietatis (quid enim dissimulemus?) tantum Nobis attulit
voluptatis, ut vere gaudio superabundaverimus in tribulatione
Nostra. Delectamur enim filiorum ac Fratrum Venerabilium

studiis, magis quam odio excruciemur inimicorum. Qua vero amoris vice tam insigne prosequamur amoris vestri testimonium, pluribus persequi haud est opus. Fratribus enim loquimur qui Fratris animum ex animo proprio valent aestimare. Deus, qui caritas est, suavissimam hanc Nos inter ac vos caritatem, firmiter in dies reddat eamque uberem. Id avemus, id supplici prece ab Eo contendimus cuius vices gerimus: dum delati memores officii, praecipuae benevolentiae Nostrae testem, Apostolicam Benedictionem Vobis omnibus, Venerabiles Fratres, et cuiusque vestrum gregi, peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, die XXX Novembris MCMX, Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

PIUS PP. X.

NEW VICARIATE APOSTOLIC IN THE TRANSVAAL

S. CONGREGATIO DE PROPAGANDA FIDE

ERECTIO NOVAE PRAEFECTURAE APOSTOLICAE TRANSVALLENSIS
SEPTENTRIONALIS

DECRETUM

Ut catholici nominis incremento in septentrionali plaga Apostolici Vicariatus Transvallensis aptius prospiceretur, opportunum consilium visum est novam in eo tractu Apostolicam Praefecturam erigere, maiori evangelicorum operariorum copia excolendam. Eñi itaque Patres huius S. Congregationis Fidei Propagandae in Plenariis Comitibus die 12 vertentis Decembris habitis a Vicariatu Apostolico Transvallensi seiungendos censuerunt duos civiles districtus de Zoutpansberg et de Waterberg, atque in earumdem districtuum coniuncto territorio novam Apostolicam Praefecturam erigendam, Patribus Benedictinis Congregationis Cassinensis Primaevae Observantiae committendam, quae Praefectura Apostolica Transvallensis Septentrionalis denominetur. Hanc vero Eñorum Patrum sententiam SSmo D. N. Pio d. pr. Pp. X. relatam ab infrascripto eiusdem S. Congregationis Secretario in Audientia diei 20 vertentis Decembris, Sanctitas Sua benigne probavit ratamque habuit, ac praesens ea super re Decretum expediri praecepit.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus S. C. de Prop. Fide, die 22 Decembris anno 1910.

L. ✠ S.

FR. H. M. CARD. GOTTI, *Praefectus*.

ALOISIUS VECCIA, *Secretarius*.

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS X. TO COUNT
VERSPEYEN OF THE 'BIEN PUBLIC DE GAND'

AD PERILLUSTREM VIRUM COMITEM GUILIELMUM VERSPEYEN,
QUINQUAGESIMO RECURRENTE ANNIVERSARIO EX QUO OPERAM
NAVARE COEPIT EDENDAE GANDAVENSI EPHEMERIDI QUAE
INSCRIBITUR 'LE BIEN PUBLIC'

Il Nous a été bien agréable d'apprendre que vous allez prochainement célébrer le cinquantième anniversaire de votre entrée dans la Rédaction du journal catholique de Gand, paraissant sous le titre 'Le Bien Public.'

En cette mémorable circonstance de votre vie si noblement et vaillamment dépensée pour la cause catholique, dans le champ de la presse, à la défense des intérêts les plus sacrés de l'Eglise et de votre pays que vous honorez par vos talents et vos mérites, Nous avons à cœur de Nous unir à votre joie, à la joie de vos nombreux amis, et admirateurs, et de vous exprimer Nos sentiments de particulière estime et bienveillance.

Comme gage des faveurs divines les plus abondantes, Nous vous accordons de tout Notre cœur la Bénédiction Apostolique.

Le 12 Décembre 1910.

PIUS PP. X.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

THE HOLY SACRIFICE OF THE MASS. In Two Parts. By Rev. Myles V. Ronan, C.C. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.

ALTHOUGH several little books on the Mass, written from a devotional point of view, have been published, yet, until now, no cheap little treatise dealing with this subject from a historical, a liturgical, or a theological aspect has been brought out. Father Ronan's little books supply this long-felt want. They are very readable and useful epitomes of the theology, liturgy, and history of the Holy Sacrifice. They can be as readily understood by a boy or girl of ten or twelve years of age as by a person of maturer years. They are treatises which we should wish to see in the hands of boys and girls of our Colleges and Convent schools. Such explanations of the doctrines of the Church, so necessary for our Catholic people in these days, should not be confined to the pulpit, but should be placed in cheap form in their hands. Father Ronan's little books will be found very useful to priests engaged in giving catechetical instructions on the Mass. They will save time and trouble. Some of the chapters that are particularly interesting are the Language, the Development, and the Effects of the Mass. These little books have already had a large sale in the Catholic Truth Society boxes, and can be obtained also through that Society.

THE PRIMACY OF ST. PETER. Correspondence on the Petrine Texts, between Dean Hackett, of Waterford, and Rev. William Byrne, of St. John's College, Waterford. Waterford: N. Harvey & Co. 1911.

THIS pamphlet gives proof of the practical value of sound scriptural and theological knowledge. In a lecture delivered in Waterford on January 30, 1910, the Rev. R. H. Benson said, amongst other things: 'He had turned to the Scriptures, and if he found anything written down there in black and white, or in letters of fire and gold, it was the Primacy of Peter, in which non-Catholics did not believe.' The Protestant Dean of Waterford got alarmed at the effect of these words, and wrote to a local paper, with a great show of learning, to contest and

confute them. A very quiet and peaceful professor in St. John's College, the Rev. William Byrne, was impressed with the flaws in Dean Hackett's arguments, and wrote to the paper in which his letter appeared to point them out. This was the beginning of a controversy carried on in a dignified but firm tone on both sides. Just a dozen letters were exchanged in the course of the controversy, and they are now embodied in this pamphlet, together with Father Benson's lecture which gave rise to them.

Father Byrne splendidly maintained the Catholic view of the case, and deserves the highest praise for both the tone and matter of his letters. It was fortunate that there should have been on the spot in Waterford a man so well able to cope with Dean Hackett, and to hold his own, and more than his own, in the controversy. We sincerely congratulate Father Byrne on the good work he has performed and on the manner in which he has accomplished it.

J. F. H.

THE KING'S BELL, AND OTHER VERSES. By William F. Power, S.J. Braine-le-Comte (Belgium) : Zeck & Son. 1910.

WE are glad to see that an old neighbour of Clongowes Wood has not wasted all his sweetness on the desert air, but has collected some of it in this handsome volume, and preserved it to posterity. Father Power has a good ear, a good eye, and, better still, a good heart; and all these organs have served him well in the production of his poems. The *King's Bell* rings true, and worthily heads the score or more of lyrics that follow. They are all musical, elevated in tone, and poetic in expression. Here and there thoughts are expressed in a very striking, happy, and melodious combination of words. Little more would have made 'In a Pleasaunce' a perfect poem; and the 'Pilgrimage of Kevelaar' hardly needs any qualification.

J. F. H.


MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR. By Rev. Louis Bronchain, C.S.S.R. Translated from the Twelfth Belgian Edition by Rev. Ferreol Girardy, C.S.S.R. Two vols. London : Herder, 68 Great Russell Street.

THE author of these meditations is a saintly Belgian priest, who died in 1892. They are intended 'for the use of all who

aspire to perfection, priests, religious, and laymen.' The fact that they have already gone through twelve editions in the original is a sufficient testimony to their usefulness and popularity. We sincerely welcome their appearance in English. They breathe the spirit of St. Alphonsus and are evidently the work of a 'man of prayer' who 'first practised what he preaches and teaches in his writings' (page vi.). They are simple in style and plan, solid, instructive, and devotional. Each consists of a very brief synopsis for preparation and two points, covering on an average three or four pages—the latter well and clearly printed and having generous margins. The two volumes contain no less than 548 meditations: the surplus over 365 consisting of meditations on the principal feasts, on the First Fridays, on the Incarnation, Passion, Eucharist, Sacred Heart, Blessed Virgin, and all the principal saints and devotions; so that an ample variety of choice is provided for. Diversity of spiritual needs prevents one from recommending any single meditation book as suitable to all; but Father Bronchain's meditations are decidedly good, and will be highly appreciated by English readers.

The translation is up to a much higher standard than is usually met in meditations from the French; it is only an occasional word or phrase that reminds us we are not reading an original. Though the volumes are neatly printed and bound, we cannot help wishing that the publishers had decided to divide the whole—2,250 pages—into four handy volumes, instead of the two rather bulky ones before us.

P. C.



THE PRAGMATIC VALUE OF THEISM

SCHOLASTICISM AND THE PRAGMATIC METHOD

IT can hardly be questioned that Scholastic Philosophy is the only systematic philosophy, the only philosophy the principles of which have been worked out consistently and in detail. Other philosophies are mere standpoints. Absolutism, though it can claim Plato as its founder, and can count a Spinoza and a Hegel among its leading exponents, has confessed of late that its misty synthesis of the underlying structure of the universe breaks down and is found to be inapplicable when it comes to a question of detail and concrete fact. Criticism, from which our modern Absolutism has sprung, is no better off. In its original bold and striking form the philosophy of Kant is at present upheld by no one. Positivism, too, though it has produced the voluminous Synthetic Philosophy of Herbert Spencer, is for the most part a bare negation; while Pragmatism, the latest product of the philosophical ingenuity of man, in so far as it transcends the limits of a mere method, is confessedly vague, tentative, inchoate, indeterminate.

So, too, in theology. There are innumerable treatises and innumerable theories, but outside Scholasticism there is no order, no system, and consequently no advance. From time to time a 'new' theology may appear that calls in question principles and dogmas hitherto accepted, but

there is no development of doctrine ; nor is such development possible, except in a Church where there is an authority to guide man's faltering footsteps and a judge to give official sanction to progress already made.

The result is the rapid spread of agnosticism and indifference. Scholasticism alone stands firm, and alone evinces continuous development ; yet, in spite of this, Scholasticism fails to make any impression upon the world at large. Among those who are well disposed, and already believe in God, the tenets of our faith are gradually acquiring for themselves a wider recognition ; but to the vast majority our doctrines make no appeal. As Bacon scorned 'the senseless verbalism and idle speculations' of the Schoolmen of his day, so the late Professor James despised 'the meaningless robe of attributes with which the Scholastic clothes his God' ; and his words are but the expression of an opinion which prevails very widely to-day.

Such a situation demands at once a remedy and an explanation. There are those indeed who say that Scholasticism is out of date, and should therefore be rejected as a useless appendage to religion. But thus to cut away at one fell swoop a system of philosophy and theology that has taken centuries to grow up, and that is admittedly more coherent and more complete than any modern alternative, is a remedy too drastic to be worthy of serious consideration. No philosophy could be less useless and no theology more practical than that of the Scholastic, rightly interpreted.

The true explanation of present-day contempt for Scholasticism is to be found not in Scholasticism itself, but rather in the form in which it is often presented. We are too dry and too formal ; our arguments are too *a priori* ; and in our philosophical and theological works, as distinguished from sermons and devotional treatises, we almost always neglect the practical aspect of our doctrines. The method we use is excellent in the lecture room, and for clearness and precision could hardly be surpassed. But, say our opponents, in spite of the awful rigour of your syllogizing, I remain unconvinced. Your reasoning is far too abstract ; your terminology too technical. Doubtless,

the arguments you use are logically valid, but the principles upon which you base them to me are far from evident, and appear to be gratuitously assumed ; while your conclusions are expressed in terms very different from those of ordinary human experience and seem to have little bearing on practical life. In a word, your principles, your terminology, indeed your whole method, savour of a bygone age, and are out of touch with the thought of to-day.

It is not difficult to appreciate the force of this objection. Because to us who view them in all their bearings, Scholastic principles are evident, it does not follow that they are evident to the uninitiated ; and once the foundation is gone the whole superstructure falls to the ground. Small wonder, then, that, failing to grasp the significance of our fundamental ideas, unfamiliar with our methods, chilled by the cold precision of our terminology, and disgusted with the formal rigidity of our arguments, the non-Scholastic rejects our conclusions and despises our philosophy, which seems to him worthless and unreal. What he wants, he tells us, are living truths—truths which not only solve the problems of the universe, but which stimulate life's flagging energies and give to human existence a meaning that is warm, actual, and full of practical significance ; but these he does not find in Scholasticism.

That our opponent is mistaken, and that his view of Scholasticism grossly misrepresents the truth, will be apparent to anyone who really understands the Scholastic position. But, if this is so, ought we not to do something more than we are doing to disabuse our fellow-men of so fatal a delusion ? If our doctrines are really valuable in practical life, as they undoubtedly are, why not point this out as we proceed, and so dispose our opponents not only to listen to our arguments but also to accept the conclusions to which they lead ? Why not try to look at things from the standpoint of the enemy, as did St. Thomas, and indeed all the great Catholic apologists ? Modern methods are different from those that were in vogue in the Middle Ages. They may be less clear and precise. That is not the question. At any rate they are different. Hence, if

we wish to convince the age in which we live of the truth of our philosophy and our theology, we shall do well for purposes of apologetic to adapt the solid arguments of Scholasticism to more modern modes of thought.

Now, current modes of thought are almost all of one type. Modern methods start with a hypothesis which they proceed to verify by showing that its consequences harmonize with the data of human experience. Intuition is no doubt involved in such a process, and many statements are made which cannot be proved, but which are none the less axiomatic or evident. But the philosopher of this twentieth century, having grown familiar with inductive or scientific methods of proof, is no longer content with *a priori* reasoning based on self-evident principles. He insists that all proof must proceed by way of postulation and experiment. Only principles that can be experimentally verified, only theories that will 'work,' satisfying human needs and human demands, and leading to no contradiction, are to be recognized as valid; the rest, no matter how great their internal consistency and logical coherence, must be rejected as 'useless knowledge.'

To the strictly scientific element in this method no intellectualist can have any objection. With it the Scholastic is quite familiar, since he uses a somewhat similar method in proving his philosophic positions and the dogmas of theology. As the scientist starts with a 'hypothesis' which he verifies by showing that its consequences agree with empirical fact, so the Scholastic, first enunciating as a 'thesis' the doctrine to be proved, next proceeds to verify it by showing that it is consistent with the teaching of Scripture, of the Fathers, and of sound philosophy and common sense. Even the Absolutist, in spite of his fondness for mere coherence, is at times forced to make use of the scientific method in order to give a semblance of truth to an otherwise irrelevant metaphysic.

In practice, however, it seldom happens that the correspondence between theoretical constructions and empirical data is complete; and—excluding divine confirmation by the voice of authority expressed in papal or conciliar

decrees—the same may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of the interpretation of dogma and of speculative theories based thereon. In some cases the evidence may be sufficient to exclude all serious grounds for doubt, but it is always possible, at least in the abstract, that some relevant fact has been overlooked, some pertinent passage been misinterpreted, or that there is some flaw in our process of deductive reasoning. The question therefore arises whether we can in any way get rid of this element of doubt by the use of other than strictly logical criteria ; and it is here that the scientific merges in the Pragmatic Method.

‘As a matter of fact,’ urges the Pragmatist, ‘in practice we frequently do use other than logical criteria. Not only are we more inclined to believe what we will or desire to believe ; but we are also influenced by emotional and practical considerations, by harmony, beauty, social advantage, utility, expediency, even by the prospect of personal gain ; and to allow such considerations to influence our judgment is not irrational. Truth must “work” practically as well as intellectually : it must satisfy not only the intellect but the whole man.’

An idea, a true belief [says M. Boutroux, in summing up the pragmatic position] is a belief at once verifiable, beneficial, efficacious—a belief which pays. But the meaning of the word ‘pay’ varies to an unlimited extent. One man accepts payment in hard cash alone. A Newton desires to be paid in generalisations which shall reduce to unity the laws of the universe. The former demands of science material enjoyment. The latter expects from her the pride of knowing and the supreme joy of penetrating the structure of things. Another man calls beneficial that which favours peace of mind, or moral power, or harmony of ideas, or the expansion or development of existence, or the realisation of society at once united and free, cherishing the ideal aims of humanity. Not one of these views is excluded by Pragmatism ; not one is logically enjoined by it. It is a method rather than a doctrine, a determination as regards the relation of theory to practice, rather than a theory of practice itself.¹

¹ *Science and Religion in Contemporary Philosophy*, 1909, pp. 281, 282.

True, this is the method of Pragmatism, and the appeal to other than strictly logical criteria is of its very essence ; but the Pragmatic Method and that wider and more metaphysical doctrine of the nature of truth and reality, which usually goes by the name of Pragmatism, must not be confused. Pragmatism as a method may be valuable enough, but Pragmatism as a metaphysical or epistemological theory is quite a different matter. It can hardly be denied that many truths for which self-evidence is claimed are not self-evident to the modern mind. Nor can it be denied that many truths which at the outset were mere postulates, have been gradually verified by a process of reasoning largely experimental in character. The *value* of truth, too, depends largely upon its utility as a means by which man accommodates himself to his environment, and upon its power to further his rational demands and satisfy his fundamental needs. But because this is so, it by no means follows, as the Pragmatist, *qua* Epistemologist, contends, that *no* truths are self-evident ; for this would destroy the very ground upon which all truth is based, and render the search for it futile. Nor does it follow that *all* truths began life as postulates, requiring experimental verification in order to pass from the status of mere claims ; for in that case the verification-process itself would need further verification, and so on indefinitely. Nor yet again because truth is valuable, in that it satisfies man's needs, are we justified in treating it as *merely* a value which in no way corresponds with reality. On the contrary, both the satisfactory character and the utility of truth presuppose this correspondence, and the Pragmatist, in substituting for correspondence mere objective 'leading' seems to me to destroy altogether the very meaning of the term 'to know.' By knowledge is ordinarily understood a judgment or system of judgments which reveal to us the nature of reality, and in order that such knowledge should be possible the mere 'functional leading' of ideas, controlled in some vague kind of way by an objective environment, is not enough. Knowledge requires that the *content* of thought be determined by its object and by its object alone.

The proper function of cognition, therefore, is unique. It may be beneficial, useful and satisfactory; it may be a most excellent instrument for the adaptation of our organic nature to its objective environment; but this is not its primary function. In knowledge reality itself is made manifest; and it is so because, and precisely in so far as, the content of our thoughts—*what* we think, as opposed to the intent of thought or the purposive psychological activity by which we think—is objectively determined. Utility, fruitful leadings, and satisfactions of various kinds may be consequences of truth, but they are not its essential nature. Hence the Scholastic can in nowise accept Pragmatism as his epistemology.

But what about the Pragmatic Method? Granted that truth is not to be identified with the verification process by which it is 'made,' are we justified in admitting into this verification-process criteria other than those which are usually recognized by the formal logician? Is it legitimate to take not only the intellectual consequences of truth but also its practical, moral, and emotional consequences as signs of truth's presence in the mind?

There is no doubt that truth has such consequences. This is admitted by St. Thomas. Indeed, he not infrequently thinks it worth while to enumerate the consequences of truth—in the Prologue to the *Contra Gentiles*, for instance, where he tells us that an increase in our knowledge of theology is accompanied by an increased earnestness of desire, and confers upon the soul a high degree of perfection.

It is also a fact that there are very many people who use hardly any but pragmatic criteria, and whose religious belief in particular rests entirely on the consequences which that belief is supposed to bring about in their personal experience, consequences which are often emotional in tone and sometimes quite irrational. 'Religion makes me feel happier; it inspires me with hope, and brings me into closer communion with God.' This is the sole reason which many thousands of people, even in this enlightened age, would be able to give for the faith that is in them, and they judge it to be a reason amply sufficient. Beneficial differences to

personal experience, emotional satisfaction, joy, hope, increased exuberance of spirits, vague yet pleasant feelings of what is taken to be communion with God—these are the criteria which are *de facto* in use to a very large extent at the present day as the criteria of religious belief.

A Ritschlianism of this extreme type cannot be too emphatically condemned. Due in part to temperament, and depending largely upon physical health and bodily condition, our emotions vary with the mood of the moment, and hence, as criteria of truth, are wholly unreliable. Doubtless emotional satisfaction is beneficial, and communion with things divine something to be desired and earnestly sought after; while hope, and the reward of its fulfilment—joy and happiness—are essential to human development which otherwise would cease. But to base one's faith upon the mere *feeling* of happiness, contentment and joy is surely the height of folly, when we remember that the cause of this feeling may be largely physical, that it often has little connexion with the belief from which it is supposed to proceed, that it would follow equally well from some other belief, and, lastly, that its indulgence tends to induce an irrational, hysterical, and decidedly unhealthy state of mind.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that such criteria are used, and used very widely, among less educated people; and this fact must be taken into account. Indeed, an appeal to the emotions would seem to be the only way in which to approach men of a certain mentality, upon whom neither *a priori* methods nor yet the more scientific method of verifying a hypothesis by its logical consequences makes any serious impression.

On the other hand, mere grounds of expediency can hardly justify us in adopting a method which makes use of such questionable arguments, unless some surer foundation can be found for the method than any that has as yet appeared. But the truth is, as I have already pointed out, that the so-called Pragmatic Method is quite independent of pragmatic epistemology. The real origin of the Pragmatic Method is to be found neither in Pragmatism nor in

Humanism ; but in the actual working of the truth-process as revealed in the facts of experience. The pragmatic doctrine of truth is an attempt—a bad one it seems to me—to find a philosophical basis for a method already in use ; whereas as a matter of fact the method has in our own Scholasticism a far more solid and reliable foundation than any that the Pragmatist can offer.

It is a first principle with the Scholastic that *omne ens est et unum et verum et bonum* ; that the True, the Good, and for that matter also the Beautiful, are, considered ontologically or objectively, but different aspects of one and the same reality. And if this is so, if truth and goodness and beauty proceed from the same activities, qualities or attributes of the concrete real thing, and are differentiated only according to the diversity of our faculties and the diversity of our points of view, then that which is apprehended as true must, if rightly apprehended, appear also to be beautiful and good. And, conversely, that which seems to us good and beautiful, and so causes in us happiness and æsthetic pleasure, must, if these satisfactions really proceed from the source to which we attribute them, also be true. Logical truth cannot be identified with moral goodness, nor can truth be defined as that which is beneficial, æsthetically pleasing, or practically useful. Yet these are none the less the consequences of truth ; and since in the concrete, truth, beauty, and goodness are at bottom one, truth must in the long run prove itself satisfactory not only to our intellect, but also to our moral judgment and our æsthetic sense of beauty and harmony.

The Scholastic doctrine of the nature of man bears out this conclusion. Man is essentially one—one organism, one single and undivided whole. He is not a bundle of faculties which exist side by side and are wholly independent. True, his faculties are distinct in that each has its own proper function, end, and object ; but the exercise of one faculty seldom, if ever, takes place in isolation. It is accompanied, I think I may say in every case, by the functioning of other faculties with which it is essentially bound up in the unity of man's nature. Volition is impossible without cognition,

and cognition involves not only intellectual activity but also sense-perception, feeling, and action, together with that ever-varying emotional tone which is never absent so long as we are conscious.

Similarly in regard to human needs which are no less essentially connected together in one organic whole, the satisfaction of one need means the satisfaction in greater or less degree of other needs. And in the end this must be so. It is impossible completely to satisfy man's intellect without at the same time satisfying his will, for man is one, and his essential nature is expressed no less by his search for the True than in his striving after the Good.

If, then, truth and goodness are ontologically one, being but different aspects of one and the same reality, and if man also is one, his various faculties and needs being but diverse functions of one and the same humanity, then it would seem that the consequences which result from the apprehension of logical truth—in so far as these consequences are natural and not due to the use man may afterwards deliberately make of truth—must also be consequences that are good for man; good, in that in the long run they promote his welfare, further his life, and satisfy his fundamental needs.

The Scholastic maintains, therefore, quite as strongly as does the Pragmatist, but with far better reason it seems to me, that what is true must also be good. He admits, too, that the will, and the emotions by which the will is moved, may influence assent. Nay more, he insists that in the supreme act by which the intellect assents to the truths of revelation—the act of supernatural faith—the final determination of the intellect is due not to the compelling force of evidence, but to the will freely co-operating with grace.

Nor have these principles, which are fundamental in the Scholastic system, been allowed to remain altogether idle. Arguments decidedly pragmatic in tone were used by Scholastics long before the Pragmatic Method was heard of.

St. Thomas, for instance, tells us that the method of theology is *narrativus signorum quae ad confirmationem fidei*

faciunt;¹ and though he is here referring to the truths of revelation and by *signa* means primarily miracles, yet the signs and *charismata* wrought by grace in confirmation of faith are not, nor ever have been, confined to external manifestations of miraculous power, but include also differences wrought in the personal experience of the individual, to which 'interior witness' both St. Paul and St. John constantly refer.²

St. Thomas, again, is very fond of appealing to *rationes congruentes* or *argumenta suasiva*,³ arguments which appeal sometimes to our æsthetic or moral taste, to our sense of what is proper and fitting, sometimes to the sayings of non-Catholic writers, to what the Pragmatist would call the testimony of 'old belief' (*argumenta extranea et probabilia*).⁴ Both kinds of argument, therefore, are 'pragmatic' in the wide sense of that term, and though neither may be convincing *per se*, both have their own peculiar force, a force which will vary considerably according to the temperament of the person to whom they are addressed.

Such arguments have always been and are still used even by the most rigid of Scholastics, and rightly so, for in regard both to nature and to God that which is orderly and beautiful and good is *pro tanto* more likely to be true than that which is out of order, and ugly, and evil or useless.

Still more striking instances of pragmatic arguments in common use among Scholastics are the Eudæmonological and the Deontological arguments and the so called Psychological argument for the immortality of the soul. The Eudæmonological argument seeks to prove the existence of God from the fact that in Him alone can man's desire for perfect happiness be completely satisfied. The Deontological argument draws the same conclusion from the fact that God alone can give ultimate realization to our moral

¹ In Lib. Sent. Prol., q. 1, a. 5. St. Thomas quotes Mark xvi. 20, in support of his statement, and in the *Contra Gentiles*, chap. vi., quotes Heb. ii. 3, 4, in a similar sense.

² Rom. viii. 16; 2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 17, 18; Gal. iv. 6; 1 Thess. i. 6 iv. 9; 1 John ii. 27; cf. 14, 20, 21; v. 10.

³ Cf. *Contra Gentiles*, Prol.

⁴ *Summa Theol.*, i. q. 1, a. 8 ad 2.

ideals and reconcile happiness with duty ; while the Psychological argument, starting from similar premises, namely, from our human desire for happiness and our human striving after a perfect moral order, argues to the effect that a soul, rationally seeking such ends and therefore capable under certain conditions of attaining them, must be immortal. All these arguments may be traced back to a doctrine which appears in the *Contra Gentiles*,¹ where the Angelic Doctor is at pains to show how in man's final happiness every human desire will be fulfilled ; and this doctrine implies the principle that truth, as a value, must in the end satisfy all our ideals, desires and aspirations, in so far as they are the rational expression of the fundamental needs of human nature.

Similar arguments may be found even earlier in the history of Christian Apologetics. Tertullian, in proof of God's existence and also of immortality, appeals to the testimony of the human soul,² to the universal experience of man, or rather to his inexperience, to that which lies beneath his experience and which is implanted in him with his very soul, to fundamental human desires and human beliefs which find expression in sayings common to all the world.

Cyprian (*circa* 250) gives a similar proof, though more briefly put, for the Providence of God ;³ while in Lactantius (*circa* 325) there is an argument for Divine Providence and Divine Justice as pragmatic as the most ardent Pragmatist could desire. Replying to the arguments of Epicurus Lactantius says :—

If God takes no trouble, nor occasions trouble to another, why, then, should we not commit crimes as often as it is within our power to escape the notice of men, and to cheat the public laws ? Wherever we shall obtain a favourable opportunity of escaping notice, let us take advantage of the occasion ; let us take away the property of others, either without bloodshed or even with blood, if there is nothing else besides the laws to be revered.

¹ Chap. lxiii.

² *De Testimonio Animae*, Migne, P.L. 2, 682ff.

³ *Lib. de Idol. Van.*, Migne, P.L. 4, 596, 597.

Whether, then, you take away from God kindness, or anger, or both, religion must be taken away, without which the life of man is full of folly, of wickedness, and of enormity. For conscience greatly curbs men, if we believe that we are living in the sight of God; if we imagine not only that the actions which we perform are seen from above, but also that our thoughts and our words are heard by God. To believe this is profitable, as some think, not for the sake of truth, but of utility, since laws cannot punish conscience unless some terror from above hangs over to restrain offences.¹

Thus not only are the principles which underlie the Pragmatic Method recognized in Scholasticism, but these principles are actually used both by the Fathers and by Scholastics in proof of Christian doctrine and metaphysical truth. Indeed, we might justly refuse to give the title 'Pragmatic' to a form of argument so ancient and so widely used, were it not that Professor James has assured us that Pragmatism is but a new name for some old ways of thinking, among which the argument from beneficial results is especially emphasized only because of late it has been the most neglected. The Pragmatist does not wish to disparage the claims of the intellect, he wishes merely to reinstate the influence, and reassert the value of the will. What matters the name, then, if the method be capable of leading us to the truth which we seek? But is it?

We have seen that truth undoubtedly has the consequences which the Pragmatist assigns to it. It is good, beautiful, beneficial, and at the same time practically useful; and could we but trace these consequences back to the particular ideas from which they seem to flow, any one of them might serve as a criterion of truth. It is precisely here, however, that the difficulty lies. We are just as likely to err in judging of the beneficial effects of an idea, a hypothesis, or a theory, as we are in judging of its evidence. Consequently, we cannot convert the proposition 'All that is true is beneficial,' unless we understand by 'beneficial' that which satisfies our deepest and most

¹ *De Ira Dei*, Lactantius, vol. ii., in the Ante-Nicene Library, p. 12.

fundamental needs ; and such a satisfaction in its fullness is during this life beyond our reach ; while in regard to emotional satisfaction, all we can say is that if our hypotheses do not in the long run lead to such satisfactions, there is something wrong somewhere, but where we cannot tell.

So far as I am aware, the Pragmatist has given no satisfactory answer to this difficulty. Yet surely the answer is not far to seek. If no one criterion, whether theoretical or practical, satisfies us when regarded singly and in isolation, we must take all our criteria together as one organic whole. We must not add argument to argument as a builder places brick upon brick, but must consider them together as one great argument, as one great consequence of concrete living truth. And we must let this truth work itself out in our experience—an experience that is not made up of isolated parts nor of the functionings of independent faculties, but is one vast and continuous whole, instinct with life and pregnant with hope and desire.

Looked at in this new light the Pragmatic Method is a very different thing from what it appeared to be when we were considering it piecemeal. Its value is now immeasurably increased, and both its applicability and its cogency indefinitely augmented. For men, owing to differences of temperament, character, and education, differ widely in their estimation of the value of various kinds of evidence, and in their appreciation of various criteria of truth, so that a keen and comprehensive intellect, grasping a complex theory as a whole, will judge of its truth almost by intuition, while another, less intellectually inclined, will be but slightly impressed by the consequences which a theory may have for him or for his fellow-men. As, however, no man is wholly devoid of intellectual capacity or wholly destitute of moral feeling and æsthetic taste, arguments which, rightly or wrongly, would seem to be of little value if taken in isolation, will one and all contribute to the cogency of proof, if they be allowed to develop themselves in the living tissue of experience as a coherent, systematic whole. If a hypothesis or theory really and truly satisfies

us all round, if it affords us not only emotional satisfaction, fulfilling our desires and bringing in its wake a feeling of happiness and content, if again it is beneficial in that it stimulates moral progress, social and individual, and generally enhances the value and significance of life, and if, over and above all this, it satisfies us intellectually, violating no canon of logical reasoning, leading to no contradiction, harmonising facts, and at the same time serving to make human life in particular and the universe in general more intelligible by revealing to us the underlying plan and structure which makes it a coherent, harmonious, and rational system, if it does all this, I say, then no rational human being can refrain from giving his assent to the truth of such a hypothesis or theory. Nay, even if the intellectual part of the proof be not of itself entirely convincing, a hypothesis which otherwise satisfies all these conditions must of necessity be true; for it is inconceivable that that which bears all the marks and leads to all the consequences of truth should yet be false. Indeed, to admit the possibility of this is practically to become a sceptic, since there are few, if any, hypotheses that are to all men intellectually convincing.

Taking men, then, as they are in this highly educated, but not wholly rational twentieth century, the value of the Pragmatic Method as a means of re-establishing Scholasticism cannot be lightly passed over. The method is admirably suited to the spirit and tendency of the age, and there could hardly be a body of doctrines to which it could be applied with greater fruit or greater facility than to the doctrines of Scholastic philosophy and Scholastic theology. That very comprehensiveness and coherence which the labours of centuries have conferred upon them, is already a strong point in their favour. Scholastic doctrines are complementary, reciprocally determining one another's significance and sphere of application, so that the Scholastic is able to avoid those exaggerations and one-sided developments which characterise other philosophies, and thus to steer clear both of the Scylla of Pantheism and the Charybdis of Radical Pluralism. And it is precisely

this reciprocity in regard to meaning and the determination of objective reference that Herr Simmel, the leading Pragmatist of Germany, holds to be one of the chief characteristics of truth, as also 'the reciprocity of mutual proof' which results from coherence, and which is again a feature of Scholasticism. Comprehensiveness and coherence restore to truth that fullness of detail of which it is deprived by the abstract character of human thought, but which is characteristic of the concrete reality we seek to know.

Harmony with old and well-established positions, again, is a characteristic of truth which cannot be too emphatically stressed. Again and again does Professor James admonish us that the assimilation of new fact must be made with a minimum of modification to old belief.¹ And respect for tradition, which is always to be found in a historic church or society, is nowhere more sincere than it is in the heart of the Scholastic.

Lastly, the moral and social benefits that result from Scholasticism can hardly be overestimated. Its teachings on the Supreme Will and Infinite Holiness of God, on the sacred and inviolable character of the moral law, on the heinousness of sin, the eternity of Hell, and the indissolubility of marriage, are among the mainstays of society. While, if consolation, hope, joy, and increased vitality are indications of truth in religious belief, no doctrines could inspire them more effectually and more intensely than the Catholic doctrines of the Incarnation, of Grace, of the Eucharist, of Purgatory, of Heaven, and of the Salvific Will and All-wise Providence of God.

All this it will be the aim of a pragmatic treatment of Scholastic doctrines to bring out. Nor would any of the old arguments have to be given up, for all are essential to the completeness of the method. At most, traditional arguments would have to be stated in a somewhat different form. Axioms and principles would not be asserted merely on the ground of their self-evidence; but we should first of all formulate all principles and all doctrines provisionally

¹ *Pragmatism*, pp. 60, 73, 168, 224; and *The Meaning of Truth*, pp. 70 sqq.

as 'hypotheses,' not of course in the sense that we should for a moment doubt their truth, any more than St. Thomas doubts the truth of God's existence when he asks, *An Deus sit?* but merely as provisional positions shortly to be proved. We should then proceed to verify our hypotheses by showing (1) that they are internally consistent, (2) that they are consistent with, and render intelligible, the facts of human experience, (3) that they are also in harmony with Scriptural teaching, traditional interpretation, and common-sense belief, and (4) that over and above these intellectual satisfactions, they are an incentive to moral progress; beneficial to society, beautiful in their harmonious concord and systematic detail, rich in their promises for the future, and a solace in present suffering and distress; in short, that they are in every way satisfactory, satisfactory to the individual, whatever his mentality, and satisfactory to the whole human race.

These are bold claims, perhaps, and an adequate proof of their validity would involve no small labour; but all who are familiar with Scholasticism will admit their justice, and will also admit, I think, that the labour of substantiating them would not be spent in vain. However repugnant Pragmatism may be as a theory of knowledge—and I, no less than other Scholastics, hold it to be both extravagant in its claims and vitiated by gratuitous assumptions and unwarranted generalizations—there can be no question but that there is much to be said in favour of the so-called Pragmatic Method. Not only is it attractive and interesting, but as the expression of a widespread reaction against the exaggerated Intellectualism of Hegel and the Absolutists, it does but express the general trend of modern thought. Again, it is undoubtedly based upon the facts of actual cognition, upon the study of the way in which truth is *de facto* built up within the human mind. It embraces, too, the scientific method of reasoning, starting as it does from hypotheses which are afterwards to be verified by their workings in concrete experience. At the same time it implies a most intimate acquaintance with the subject to which it is to be applied. And lastly, by the

all-embracing character of its criteria, by its use of concrete illustration and example, and by its insistence upon the necessity of expressing all truths in terms of the differences that they make to actual and personal experience, it appeals to minds of every type, to the 'tough-minded' and to the 'tender-minded' to the scientist and to the man in the street, to the artistic, the emotional, the moral, the religious. The Pragmatic Method is essentially a human method, a method of values; and the values which it recognizes are multiple and varied, so that whatever a man's bent, whatever his tone of mind, somehow or other a thesis—and above all a Scholastic thesis—if pragmatically worked out, will appeal to him, and in the end, when he has tested it in the living tissue of his own experience, will validate itself.

LESLIE J. WALKER, S.J.

HOLY WEEK IN SPAIN

OUTSIDE Oberammergau with its Passion Play, there is no place in the world where the story of Calvary is brought so vividly home to one as in the streets of the Spanish cities during the days of Holy Week. Spain is famous for its beautiful processions, and amongst them those of Holy Week easily hold the first place. For the subjects of a Protestant government, especially where the Catholic religion has been banned for centuries, it is difficult to form an idea of the magnificence of the public manifestations of an entire Catholic people, their importance in the religious life, or the enthusiasm evoked on the occasions of the great anniversaries.

During Holy Week in Spain many well-to-do country families change their residence to the cities, in order that they may take part in the more important religious functions which are held there; the poorer folk who live near a city pass the days or part of them in it, and the villagers in the remote districts celebrate their own 'Holy Funeral' in a less ostentatious manner.

In those days religious fervour is much in evidence all over Spain; the churches are being constantly visited, the vast majority fulfil the Paschal precept and all look forward to the solemn representation of the sad scenes of Calvary, still honoured and recalled with gratitude throughout an interval of well-nigh two thousand years. Following the advice of Scripture, the Spaniards join fasts and almsgiving to their prayers at this time: 'Prayer is good with fasting and alms, more than to lay up treasures of gold.'¹ Ecclesiastics are bound to observe a continuous black fast on all the days of Holy Week, the lay people only on the last four days; and the Cathedral Chapters and other religious confraternities distribute their alms between the feast of Dolours and Easter Sunday.

¹ Tobias xii. 8.

Holy Thursday is a great national holiday, all the public offices are closed, no business is done, and even carriages of any kind are not allowed to drive through the city streets. People may drive to the holy Offices in the morning, but they return on foot—the carriages go back to the stables and are not required until after the ‘Gloria’ on Holy Saturday morning. Even the King when he attends the ceremonies outside Madrid walks to and from the Cathedral and the other points where he may have engagements.

After the mid-day meal on Holy Thursday the universal occupation is visiting the innumerable Altars of Repose. These are called in Spanish ‘monumentos,’ and in some churches, as in the Seville Cathedral, there is a specially constructed beautiful monument standing a hundred feet high in the central nave and intended for the custody of the Blessed Sacrament. Etiquette on this day prescribes for the military of all ranks full-dress uniform, for gentlemen a dress suit, tall hat, with white tie and gloves; and in the ladies’ toilette the most remarkable item is the beautiful white lace mantilla which is worn at church functions only, at weddings and on Holy Thursday. The appearance of the vast crowds that throng the streets and churches is always a pleasing sight, and when one remembers that their presence is an act of homage to our Divine Lord in the Blessed Eucharist, it cannot fail to become a source of deep consolation. The evening is occupied either by a procession or by the Offices of Tenebræ. The most notable event in connexion with the Tenebræ Offices is the *Eslava Miserere*, which is sung in the Seville Cathedral on the nights of Wednesday and Thursday in Holy Week. The best singers in Spain are invited to help in its rendering, and it is listened to by probably fifteen thousand people standing spell-bound in one of the most beautiful and largest temples in Christendom. Father Eslava was a Canon of the Cathedral, and composed the music specially for Holy Week and Seville. A recent visitor to Seville described the scene in the following terms :—

Never to be forgotten was the Cathedral echoing . . . to the

sound of Eslava's *Miserere* sung by hundreds of trained voices. Men and women stood in silence with upraised faces as they listened to the music of the old Canon who once sat in the choir. The lightest mocker would be awed to silence under the soaring arches. . . . Two scenes stand out unforgettable in Seville's Holy Week: Eslava's *Miserere*, and that other picture . . . the ladies in mantillas paying their silent visits to the Blessed Sacrament on Holy Thursday.¹

On Good Friday the Passion sermons commence as early as five o'clock in the morning, continuing in the different churches until the dinner hour, and when the mid-day meal is over they are resumed in the early afternoon. It is hardly necessary to describe the church functions of Holy Week, as they are identical throughout the whole Western Church, but there are two touching ceremonies in Spain which are not universal and are worthy of notice. Both are performed at the Chapel Royal in Madrid, and one of them also in all the cathedral churches. The first is the washing of the feet of twelve poor men by the King or the Bishop, performed on Good Friday, and the other is the pardon granted by the King from death sentences during the Mass of the Pre-Sanctified. Some time before Holy Week the poorest and oldest dozen men in the diocese or in the neighbourhood of Madrid are sought out. They are presented with a suit of clothes, part of which is a comfortable cloak, a very common garment in Spain. Seated on a raised platform, and arrayed in their new costumes, they assist at the Passion sermon, and afterwards the King, assisted by the court officials, or the Bishop by his canons, washes the feet of each, and they are dismissed, after being regaled with the best dinner the day allows and a present of money. After the Elevation of the Host on Good Friday the Minister of Justice approaches the King with the documents destined to save the lives of some unfortunate men from the hands of the public executioner. It is a solemn moment and a moving spectacle when the King signs his name, then stands up and declares publicly: 'I pardon

¹ E. Boyle O'Reilly, *Heroic Spain*, pp. 302-315.

those misguided men who have broken the laws of my kingdom, even as I expect the Almighty to pardon me and my people.'

In some places processions are held every evening from Palm Sunday until Easter Saturday, and processions of the Resurrection are not uncommon on Easter Sunday. The only difference between the various processions consists in the emblems which are carried along—for instance, the beautiful casket representing a coffin is only displayed on Good Friday. To give an idea, then, of all the Holy Week processions it will be sufficient to describe that of the 'Holy Funeral,' which takes place on Good Friday evening. It requires no small spirit of sacrifice to take part in any of the processions, as the shortest time occupied in covering the whole route is usually not less than four hours. Some of the confraternities leave their churches at four o'clock, and when they return after visiting the principal *plaza* and the cathedral it is often close on midnight. Furthermore, many carry a wooden cross about ten feet long on their shoulders, and I have seen some making the whole pilgrimage bare-footed, although it is most unusual to see even poor children without boots in Spain. Those who wear no boots during the procession suffer intensely when passing over the cold stone pavements of the cathedrals; and if the weather be sharp, as it frequently is in March, the whole journey is a series of mortifications.

The success of the processions depends altogether on the numerous confraternities that take part in them. These are attached to the various churches, and are under the direction of the parish priests. The members hold meetings from time to time. They have one day set apart for a general Communion, when a special preacher is invited to address them; and whenever any member dies there is a solemn Requiem Mass, at which all the living members are expected to assist as well as at the funeral. These privileges, with the indulgences granted and each member's own desire to honour the Passion of our Lord, are the only motives members have for joining the confraternity. In the processions the Nazarenes, as the members of the confraternities are called,

cannot be recognized, for all are covered from head to foot in the uniform of their guild. The head-dress is of a conical shape and descends to the shoulders, with openings only for the eyes and mouth; the gown is like an alb bound by a girdle, except that it has a long train and is usually made of rich purple velvet. There are slight differences in colour and form between the costumes of the various confraternities. The most important emblem of the confraternity is the large platform of wood on which appears one or more statues of the principal personages that figure in the history of the Passion. Some of them represent the Agony in the Garden, others the Scourging at the Pillar, the Meeting with Veronica, the Crucifixion, the Mater Dolorosa, etc. As these tableaux are supposed to give a consecutive history of the Passion the processions of Holy Week are not called 'procesiones' in Spanish, but 'Los Pasos,' that is, 'the Steps,' towards Calvary. Some of the most touching of the scenes presented to us are those of our Blessed Lady. She is often represented as sitting alone beneath the vacant cross, overcome with sorrow—it is called 'La Soledad,' or the bereavement. The huge tableaux seem to move of themselves; each is carried by some thirty men who walk beneath, completely concealed by a curtain which falls from the platform to the ground on all sides. The men walk very slowly, and rest every hundred yards or so; this explains the long time occupied in carrying out the procession.

The figures of the tableaux are generally worthy pieces of workmanship, and frequently rare works of art, the creation of Spain's most famous sculptors. The most remarkable statues of our Lord are those of Martinez Montañez, who united a deep religious sentiment with a profound study of the anatomy of the human body. On Good Friday afternoon the members of the confraternities foregather at their respective churches, assume their costumes, and proceed slowly towards the principal square in the city. First comes the parish cross and other parochial insignia, then two long lines of Nazarenes, who carry lighted candles if they do not bear a cross; the tableau is carried

in the centre, and some societies have more than one ; finally comes the body of clergy, supported by their most important parishioners. All the confraternities follow this order, and are often separated from each other by a city or military band, which at intervals discourses sacred music.

If the procession passes before the home of a sick person the friends sometimes ask the carriers to make a halt before the house, in order that they may get the prayers of the multitude. The carriers turn the 'Paso' towards the house of sickness, and the bystanders go on their knees and pray for a few moments. It is very edifying to see the multitudes bowed in prayer in the public street beneath the shadow of the cross, on which our Lord is represented as suffering even unto death for all the ills of mankind.

The exuberant piety of the Spaniards often finds expression in a weird musical salutation sung by men and women during the procession. They are short fervent outbursts of love or compassion addressed to our Lord or the Blessed Virgin as their statues appear at a turn of the streets. They learn these couplets as children, or compose them later in life. The most remarkable thing about them is their unexpectedness ; nobody knows who is going to sing a 'saeta,' as they are called ; they are sung under the influence of deep religious fervour and go quivering through the still air. For this reason they bear the name of 'saetas,' or arrows. In Salamanca the procession files through the cloisters of the University before reaching the Cathedral ; and as each 'Paso' reaches the western entrance it is met by two doctors in academic dress, and conducted through the University to the exit on the opposite side. These are the same doctors who kept guard before the Blessed Sacrament during the whole time it remained in the Altar of Repose at the University church.

The favourite stand for witnessing the 'Holy Funeral' is the chief square of each city ; for the whole procession, including all the confraternities, makes it a point to pass through it. As each tableau enters the square it becomes the cynosure of all eyes, and many drop on their knees to

pray for a few moments. At one time we notice the cruel attitude of the Jewish leaders, again the compassionate conduct of Veronica ; at others the harrowed features of St. John and Mary Magdalen, or the utter desolation of the Virgin Mother. Each sad scene that goes by suggests its own peculiar series of reflections.

After the Crucifixion, at some distance comes a casket with glass panels and a waxen representation of the dead Saviour. It is accompanied by four priests in albs and stoles, and four members of the civil guard with arms reversed. Then comes the tableau representing the be-reaved Mother of Christ sorrowing alone beneath a tenant-less cross, and the procession is closed by the Bishop, supported by the chief authorities, both civil and military.

It is an impressive experience to find oneself in a Spanish city during a Holy Week procession. The ghostly processionists move slowly and in perfect order ; on the sidewalks a dense highly-strung crowd, and the houses from roof to cellar are a sea of human faces. There is very little conversation for a Spanish crowd, and the air is filled by the solemn strains of the bands. Suddenly an agonizing 'saeta' strikes on the ear, and the whole assemblage is moved in sympathy with the sorrow of the singer. Practically the entire population of the city witness the processions, and in important centres, like Seville, they are joined by thousands of strangers and foreigners. The great majority follow the proceedings with profound sympathy. One feels with thanksgiving that despite the ignominious death of our Lord, He still reigns supreme in the hearts of a great people who understand His message.

I fancy I hear some inhabitant of those cold Northern climes carping at the Holy Week celebrations of the Spaniards as being too theatrical : Oberammergau also has its critics. *De gustibus non disputandum*, and if we allow individuals their peculiar likes and dislikes *a fortiori* we should allow them to distinct nations. To others the Spaniards may seem extravagant ; but to themselves their customs are most natural ; they are too artistic to tolerate what is not genuine. On the other hand we never hear

anyone complain of their excessive courtesy and unbounded good-nature, which are proverbial.

For my own part, I can honestly say that far from their being a travesty of sacred subjects, one feels better for having witnessed these grand solemn processions of Holy Week ; and my prayer is that Spain may long keep in mind and act on the promise¹ of our Divine Lord : ' Everyone that shall confess Me before men, I will also confess him before My Father who is in Heaven.'

M. J. O'DOHERTY.

¹ Matt. x. 32.

DEATH--REAL AND APPARENT

EVER since the sentence of expulsion, with its concomitant evils, was pronounced against Adam, man has been struggling with the problem of death. And although the immunity from death which Adam was to have enjoyed was a preternatural gift, and the act of dying as natural to man as the act of being born, still men contemplate the ordeal of dying with a certain amount of horror, and will go to no end of trouble and expense to keep death at bay as long as possible.

Theology is mainly concerned with death as being the end of man's probationary life ; as being the expiration of the term which God has assigned the individual wherein he may merit eternal salvation or eternal damnation ; and in this connexion it is of supreme importance for the priest in charge of souls to be able to distinguish real from apparent death, or at all events to be guided in the administration of the last Sacraments by prudence and liberality.

It is not my intention to argue here for the spirituality and immortality of the soul against the Materialist and the Rationalist ; so if we take these truths as being established, we may define death briefly as being the separation of soul and body. This definition will serve very well for our present purpose, for it will enable us to keep in view the real distinction between the soul and the body, since the idea of separation necessarily involves the idea of real distinction.

Now it is strange that while Medicine has made such progress within recent years as to perform almost miraculous cures, it has not yet been able to discover any means whereby we may know with absolute certainty the precise moment at which death takes place. We have several signs of greater or less degrees of *probability*, but the most eminent members of the medical profession are agreed that there is really no certain and *universal* sign of death other than decomposition of the whole body, and that in a somewhat

advanced stage. As this change in the body, however, cannot take place except a considerable time *after* death, it merely shows us that the person is dead without giving us any infallible means of judging when death actually occurred.

Physicians tell us that death may approach in three ways : (1) death from the brain (*mors per apoplexiam*) ; (2) death from the respiratory organs (*mors per asphyxiam*) ; (3) death from the heart (*mors per syncope*m). In most cases there is a combination of these three, because the disease that attacks any one of these organs is generally communicated in its effects to one or both of the others. But in cases of sudden death one of these organs may cease to act while another continues to perform its functions for some time. Thus, in cases of sudden death by syncope, in an otherwise healthy individual, respiration may continue without external manifestation, after the heart has ceased to beat and circulation has stopped ; just as the heart may continue to beat for some time after apparent death by asphyxia.

It may not be without interest to give here in detail the result of observations carried out by MM. Regnard and Loye, on the body of a criminal put to death by the guillotine at Amiens, and published in *Le Progrès Médical*, July, 1887.¹

Up to the moment the knife fell the face maintained its natural colour, which persisted when the head was examined two seconds afterwards. The features were immobile, and eyelids widely open, the pupils moderately dilated ; the mouth was firmly closed ; the head presented no trace of spontaneous movement, nor of fibrillary contraction. No result was produced by presenting the finger immediately before the eye, but on touching the eyeball or the extremities of the eyelashes, the eyelids contracted as promptly as in the living subject during the first five seconds after death. Six seconds after death this reflex could no longer be evoked. One minute after decapitation the face commenced losing colour, the mouth remained closed ; light produced no movement of the iris ; the trunk was flexed ; the carotids still ejected blood. At the end of four minutes the face

¹ Vide *Medical Jurisprudence*. By Vivian Poore. Second edition, p. 62.

was entirely exsanguine. The body was closely observed for twenty minutes, after which interval the autopsy was commenced. On opening the thorax, the heart was found to be still beating, and on opening the pericardium regular rhythmical contractions of auricles and ventricles were observed until the twenty-fifth minute after decapitation. Post-mortem rigidity did not supervene until three hours after death.

This is rather an unusual case, and one that the priest is not likely to encounter in the administration of the Sacraments, but it is useful as giving us the observations of two skilled physicians on the process of death, and seems to support the opinion arrived at by the Academia de los Santos Cosme y Damian, Barcelona, namely, that no one really dies at the moment which is ordinarily considered his last, but that death comes some time later.

The difficulty of determining the moment of death arises, I think, in great part if not altogether, from our inability to comprehend the nature of the union of body and soul. We learn from Psychology that the human soul is united to the body as its substantial form (*tamquam forma substantialis*), and from this union results the suppositum Man. We know, too, that this union is produced by or at generation, that it is maintained during life, and that it is dissolved at death, but as to *how* this union is effected or how it is dissolved we can no more explain than we can explain how from the union of the divine and human nature there results but one suppositum in Christ. And indeed this comparison is made in the Athanasian Creed: 'Sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo: ita Deus et homo unus est Christus.'

From what has been said it follows that although man partakes of the three forms of life—the vegetable, the animal, and the rational—there are not in man three principles of life corresponding to these three forms, but only one: the rational life being the principium from which all three spring. It was held by some theologians that the fetus existed for some time before the human soul was infused, but that opinion, although supported by the weighty testimony of St. Thomas, is now rejected as erroneous, and

the unanimous opinion on this question now is that the vegetable, the animal, and the rational life begin and end simultaneously.

We conclude, then, (1) that in no case does death occur until the soul absolutely ceases to inform the body; and (2) that in no case does the rational soul cease to inform the body as long as any vital function takes place therein.

Now, let us take a case in which the heart suddenly stops, while the lungs, by means of the reserve force of nutrition stored up, continue to act. Can such action be considered a *vital* action produced by the agency of the soul really present? or is it merely an effect produced indeed by the soul, but continuing after the soul has departed? just as when we press an electric bell it continues to ring for some time after we have withdrawn the pressure.

That such actions may take place *after death* seems to be the opinion of an eminent professor¹ of University College, London. I shall quote his words: 'I take it that just as *the heart may beat for a few minutes after sudden death . . . so the growth of the hair may, theoretically, proceed for a few minutes after death.*'² It we take death here, according to our definition in the beginning, as being the separation of soul and body, I fail to see how such an opinion can be sustained. These cannot be considered other than vital functions since they are *motus ab intrinseco in intrinsecum*, and as such they must proceed from the *principium vite*, or, in other words, they must be informed by the rational soul actually present.

The same arguments hold good in cases where the heart stops while respiration goes on for some time afterwards.

A greater difficulty presents itself in a case where the body is divided, e.g., in the case of the guillotined criminal above cited. We there saw that from observations made at the time it was found that five seconds after decapitation the eyelids contracted as promptly as in the living subject, when the eyeballs or the extremities of the eyelashes were touched. We also saw that *twenty minutes after decapi-*

¹ Vivian Poore, *Medical Jurisprudence*. Second edition, p. 64.

² The italics are mine.

tation the heart was found to be still beating. Now there cannot be any doubt, from what we have been saying, that the soul continued to exist in the trunk as long as the heart continued beating, i.e., that the soul was present in the body for at least twenty minutes after the head was severed. But what about the head? How explain the contraction of the eyelids, on being touched five seconds after decapitation? If you can prove that this was an effect produced entirely by an external cause, then, of course, the difficulty vanishes; but if you say it was a vital action, a *motus ab intrinseco*, then I answer that the soul existed in the head as long as this effect could be produced. From what we know of the nature of the soul I see no difficulty in admitting this. The soul exists in the body *modo definitivo*, i.e., it exists 'tota in toto corpore et tota in singulis corporis partibus'; may we not, then, admit that if different members of the body are separated the soul *may* continue to exist in each, and also that when it ceases to inform one of the severed members it does not necessarily cease to inform the others?

We have a somewhat parallel case in the Blessed Eucharist. Christ is present in the Eucharist as the soul is present in the body, i.e., *modo definitivo*, and we know from divine revelation that, *seperatione facta*, Christ exists whole and entire in every part of the species. Is it wrong, then, to conclude that the soul *may* continue to exist in different parts of the body after they have been separated? I say *may*, because I am well aware that the argument, if pushed to its logical conclusion, would carry us too far, for it would prove that the soul is not only *actually* present in *some* parts of the body after separation, but that it continues to exist in each and every part that is severed—a conclusion which I do not undertake to defend.

But without pressing the comparison, there is sufficient parity between the two cases to show that there is at least no insurmountable difficulty in admitting the presence of the soul in two or more disjointed members of the body. To sum up, we conclude that no one can tell at what exact moment the soul ceases to inform the body, and that

consequently there may be latent life and even conscious life in a person to all appearances dead.

I think these facts have not been receiving the amount of attention they deserve. We do occasionally hear of the danger of premature burial, and a demand for more stringent legislation to regulate the issuing of death certificates, but I imagine there is not so much cause for alarm in this respect, for a person whose life is at such a low ebb as not to respond to any of the known tests, is not likely to survive very long.

It is with regard to the administration of the Sacraments in these cases that the greatest danger is to be apprehended. We know with what haste the death of a person is generally announced. One is suffering from a lingering illness; some night he becomes suddenly worse; his relatives and friends are gathered round his bed, and in a few moments the news goes forth that he is dead. Or it may be that a person is suddenly struck down by a stroke of apoplexy or by heart failure; he does not exhibit any signs of life for some time, and those around hasten at once to pronounce him dead. They may not think of summoning medical assistance, they may not think of sending for the priest, and thus it may happen that the unfortunate person suffers spiritual as well as physical death, when one or both might have been avoided.

We may here ask: How is the priest, as minister of the Sacraments, to act when called in the case of one apparently dead? I presume the most satisfactory way to answer this question is to give the opinions of some of the best theologians.

Villada¹ considers that, for six minutes after what seems to be the moment of death, there is a doubt in favour of the presence of life, and the Sacraments may be administered. I do not, see, however, the reason for limiting the time to six minutes. Génicot² holds that the Sacraments must be administered if the priest arrives just after breath, pulse-beats, and heart-beats have ceased. In Palmieri's Bellerini³

¹ *Casus*, iii., 244.

² ii., 422.

³ v., 238.

it is laid down (without specifying any time), that the slenderest hope of the validity of the Sacraments is enough to make it our duty to administer the Sacraments to a dying man. Lehmkuhl¹ says we should administer the Sacraments if there be any doubt whatever, be it never so small, in favour of the subject's being alive and in proper dispositions. The views of Bucceroni, La Croix, Marc, and others on this question are summed up in the Instruction of Eichstadt thus: 'It is better to expose a Sacrament to the danger of invalidity, than man to the danger of eternal damnation.'

It will be seen that if we follow the opinions of the majority of the authors cited, and if we assume that there is no infallible sign of death, and consequently the possibility of life, as long as the body remains incorrupt, we should have a great amount of latitude indeed in these cases. Of course there is no question here of administering the Sacraments *absolutely*; nor do I wish to extend the rule, especially with regard to absolution, to the case of a person who was *certainly* known to be a heretic; but making all allowance for the reverence due to the Sacraments, I think the advice of Dr. Icard to his medical colleagues applies, *servatis servandis*, with even greater reason to the physicians of the soul: 'It is far better to treat a dead man as if he were alive, than to treat a live man as if he were dead.'

JOHN J. SHERIDAN.

¹ii., n. 273.

SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY¹

IT is not without some slight misgiving that I venture this evening to speak to you upon a subject with the name of which at least you are all happily familiar. It may, however, comfort you to know that this misgiving is in no way due to the polemical character which certain persons, for reasons best known to themselves (though by no means unknown to others), have professed to discover in this subject. Nor does it come, as perhaps some cynic might suggest, from the fact that finding myself in the presence of a society of intelligent men who are not Privy Councillors, I feel that the insidious theologic bias of my philosophical system can no longer be concealed. My sense of misgiving has a deeper and (shall I say) a more respectable source. It springs from a difficulty which inevitably confronts anyone who attempts to compress a vast and complicated system of philosophy into such a brief paper as mine must be; a problem that would present itself in just as compelling a manner did I propose to give you some idea of the philosophical systems of Kant or Hegel or (as Nietzsche, I think, somewhere calls him) that respectable mediocrity, Herbert Spencer. This difficulty is intensified in the case of Scholastic Philosophy by the fact of its enormous historical development, which extends over a period of eleven hundred years, from the ninth century to the present day. Moreover, I am not without some suspicion that if I could *per impossibile* deal satisfactorily with this immense subject in the brief time at my disposal, I should

[¹ This paper was originally read before the Belfast Literary Society, a fact which will explain, if not justify, the selection of certain aspects of the subject for detailed treatment. It is not to be supposed that because I have here dealt with certain questions, I therefore regard them as serious problems. No scholar could regard the issues raised in recent controversies as genuine difficulties. Almost the only grave mistake that could be made in this connexion would be to take them seriously. In preparing this paper for publication I have introduced some few necessary modifications and added occasional footnotes.]

have succeeded in performing a task which so far at least has baffled the ingenuity of many deeply earnest if not very well-informed persons, namely, the invention of a really plausible argument against the existence of a chair of Scholastic Philosophy in our University, for then—to vary somewhat essentially a well-known question—‘though at very little cost what have I been engaged to perform?’

As the subject, then, is so extensive, it becomes necessary to make some selection of those aspects of it that are likely to excite your interest. I hope, in addition, that you will form a correct estimate of the amount of information which you can expect to receive from a paper like the present. People of rare intellectual innocence are occasionally to be met with who assail one with the monstrous demand: ‘Can you tell me some small, compact, and simple volume from which I can get an accurate idea as to what Scholastic Philosophy means? You are aware,’ they add, and here their tenderness of mind becomes quite overwhelming, ‘that I know practically nothing about philosophy, but I should like so much to get some idea as to what all this Scholastic controversy is about.’ The search for a work with so many qualifications resembles, I fear, the search for the philosopher’s stone. If the same demand is made concerning the philosophies of Kant or Hegel (to revert to my previous illustration) the difficulty of satisfying it becomes obvious. These philosophers have indeed in a marvellous degree the qualification of being ‘too cunning to be understood.’ But apart altogether from this useful gift, there is the general difficulty that philosophy is a subject from its very nature largely esoteric and incapable of being grasped piecemeal. The truth, in Hegelian phraseology, is the whole. The idea of popularizing philosophy seldom works out in practice, for in proportion as the procedure is popular it not unfrequently tends to be unphilosophical.¹

In the present paper, then, I can at most give you a brief and sketchy outline of the subject generally, and

¹ ‘Sicut patet in rustico, qui nullo modo philosophiae subtiles considerationes capere potest.’—St. Thomas, *Contra Gentiles*, bk. i. ch. iii.

perhaps enter in some detail into certain points which have been prominently emphasized in recent discussions. You must be satisfied to learn in a general way the *results* at which Scholastic Philosophy arrives on the greater issues ; it would take a very considerable time and perhaps a more patient hearing than I could reasonably claim to explain in detail the complicated lines of argument by which these results are reached. I hope, however, to be able to put before you in outline the Scholastic world-view, its theory of reality and of life.

Systems of philosophy may be considered from a two-fold standpoint. We may study them either historically or what I may call doctrinally. We may trace on the one hand their origin and development at a definite historical period, or we may consider critically the nature of their theories about the universe, their answers to the problems with which reality constantly confronts the human mind. It would be impossible in this paper to enter at any length into the question of the historical development of Scholasticism. As I have already hinted that history covers a period of eleven hundred years, and embraces many men of great name and a vast variety of opinions and theories. You are aware that the Scholastic movement is usually regarded as originating in the philosophical work of an Irishman, Joannes Scotus Eriugena whom (and this I mention for your historical edification) a certain Scotch expert, impressed apparently with the all-pervading truth of the doctrine of metempsychosis, regards as the same person as Duns Scotus, who lived some centuries later !¹ Eriugena

¹ In finding the beginning of the Scholastic movement in the work of Eriugena I follow the common opinion, although I am not unaware of the strength of M. De Wulf's position that Eriugena rather developed what may be called Anti-Scholasticism. At all events his system furnished the chief stimulus to the philosophical thinking of his time. The almost incredible blunder of Professor Seth will be found in the official Proceedings before the Committee of the Privy Council, p. 37. The Professor unburdens himself as follows : ' Of course there have been a variety of students, Duns Scotus and others, who have been condemned as heterodox. The official Scholastic view of the Church has always been, I think, that science and theology can be harmonized, or that reason and faith can be harmonized, but that is an ideal which is never completely attained by the human creature. It is never possible for us to completely rationalize the content of faith. That would be the ideal.' When one remembers the

was a man of amazing ability and of very extensive learning for his time. At a period when Greek was practically unknown upon the Continent, it is a rare testimony to the culture of our Irish schools that Eriugena was acquainted with that language and translated the works of the Pseudo-Dionysius. His philosophical views are largely influenced by the modified Neo-Platonism he found in Dionysius, and in fact his system acted rather as a negative stimulus to succeeding thought than as a positive influence. I can merely mention the names of the great thinkers who followed him and laid the main lines of the Scholastic system—such names as those of Abélard who, in his *Sic et Non*, outlined the Scholastic method; of St. Anselm, the first of the great constructive Scholastics; of Peter Lombard, whose work, the *Sentences*, had such an important influence in later medieval times; of Alexander of Hales, the founder of the great Franciscan school; of St. Bonaventure; of Albertus Magnus, the master of Aquinas; and of Duns Scotus (perhaps the most original and subtle thinker of the Middle Ages). It is, however, in the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas that we find the characteristic expression of medieval Scholasticism, and it is largely in the form in which he shaped his philosophical theories that Scholasticism has continued to be and still is a living force. I regret that it is not possible for me to enter at length into the philosophical aspects of that most brilliant period of European history, the thirteenth century. The wealth of Greek philosophical culture—the Neo-Platonic-Arabian-Aristotelianism—which then came into contact with Western thought, was rapidly assimilated and united into a wonderfully perfect system with the previous

Thomistic theory of the relation between reason and faith, this statement seems simply monstrous. One can trace in it, leaving aside the daringly original discovery concerning Duns Scotus, a confusion between the Scholastic view of the relation between theology and philosophy, and a modern view developed mainly by certain thinkers of the Hegelian school. St. Thomas, of course, maintains that reason and faith can be 'harmonized,' but he certainly does not maintain that 'the content of faith can be completely rationalized.' This latter statement is equivalent to holding that no mysteries, properly so called, are contained in Christian belief, a view condemned by the Vatican Council. The answer of Mr. Justice Johnson to the confused remarks of the Professor was admirably appropriate. Mr. Justice Johnson: 'I am afraid we are drifting into deep water.'

philosophical theories of the West, which had drawn their inspiration largely from the works of St. Augustine :—

In this way was completed [says Windelband, in that style with which German histories of philosophy have rendered us familiar] an adjustment and arrangement of world-moving thoughts upon the largest and most imposing scale that history has seen. . . . The intellectual founder of this system was Albert of Bollstädt. It owes its organic completion in all directions, its literary codification, and thus its historical designation to Thomas Aquinas, and finds its poetical exposition in Dante's *Divine Comedy*.¹

The remarkable revival of Thomism during the last century—the Neo-Scholastic movement, as it is often called—is in many ways the most interesting event in the philosophical world of our time. The causes of this revival are complex and manifold. Thomism, indeed, had never ceased to be a living philosophy, but owing to complicated historical causes, and in later times to the wide diffusion of that engine of philosophic evil, the rigidly stereotyped text-book, it had come to be somewhat discredited because not thoroughly understood. Cartesian and Kantian influences were predominant even in the Roman schools. The revival of a historical interest in medieval life (evidenced by the work of such historians as Sismondi, Barante, Guizot, Augustin Thierry, Michelet, and still more the recent French school), helped to open the way to a correct understanding of the value of medieval thought. If we insist on finding something in the spirit of the time, some stream of tendency with which this Neo-Scholastic movement may be connected, and so drawn out of its apparent isolation, reference might be made to the general artistic cult of medieval life that is traceable throughout the nineteenth century. In the sphere of letters we find it in the works of De Maistre, Hugo, De Vigny, Lamartine, Sir Walter Scott, and numberless others; in poetry, in the romantic movement generally; in painting, in the Pre-Raphaelites, who recall the work of Giotto and Fra Angelico; in music,

¹ *A History of Philosophy*, Eng. Trans., p. 311.

in Weber and Wagner and Gounod, and the rest, who renew the spirit of modern music by drawing on medieval themes. In the purely philosophical sphere the influence of the French 'Ideologists' has been justly emphasized by M. Picavet.¹ The Scotch school, with which the 'Ideologists' have some affinity, was not unsympathetic, though scarcely brilliantly enlightened. One remembers with pleasure Sir William Hamilton's castigation of Archbishop Whately for his remarks upon Scholastic logic. The French writers, however, performed work of permanent value. Cousin edited portions of the works of Abélard. Jourdain produced his well-known work upon the philosophy of St. Thomas. Hauréau published a history of Scholastic Philosophy which, in spite of many errors, still fixed the attention of Continental scholars upon the remarkable importance of medieval thought. Rénan wrote upon Averroës; Rémusat upon Abélard and St. Anselm. Thus the tide of interest was rising which finally resulted in the Neo-Scholastic movement, which has produced a multitude of eminent historical and philosophical scholars (men like Denifle, Ehrle, Mandonnet, Baeumker, Cardinal Mercier), and is destined, as we think, to be the philosophy of the future—'Est quasi perennis philosophia.'

I cannot now linger upon the many interesting phases of the Neo-Scholastic movement in Italy, Spain, France, Germany, Belgium, and elsewhere, not to mention its fortunes nearer home. I must hasten to explain to you the general nature of Thomism as a philosophical system. But before doing so it is necessary to direct your attention to a fallacy somewhat after the manner of what Bacon would call an '*Idol of the Tribe*,' into which the modern mind is almost inevitably betrayed in dealing with this subject. A story is told of an old-fashioned pedagogue who, owing to the confusion of his personal mental development with the historical sequence of events, had arrived at the startling conclusion that large portions of 'Hamlet' were borrowed verbatim from Smith's *English Grammar*.

¹ *Esquisse d'une Histoire Générale et Comparée des Philosophies Médiévales.*

This story, though probably a libel upon an innocent man, admirably illustrates the attitude of the modern mind towards Scholasticism. We suffer from an almost unavoidable illusion of historical perspective. The time-stream seems to run away from us into the past instead of flowing towards us. Now that a knowledge of medieval speculations is becoming more widely diffused, philosophers are amazed at the remarkable resemblance between certain modern theories (as those of Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, and Hegel) and older Scholastic views. Dr. Perrier, for example, tell us of Hegel that 'his system presents so striking a resemblance with those of the Scholastics that one might be tempted to believe that he has borrowed directly from them.'¹ And in fact the thinking of most modern philosophers is steeped in medieval theories. Even those thinkers who flattered themselves upon having finally broken with Scholasticism, still speak the language and think the thoughts of the Schoolmen. It is quite impossible to definitely destroy historical continuity. Descartes' philosophy rests upon St. Augustine (his methodic doubt), upon St. Anselm (his theodicy), upon Duns Scotus (his theory of the will). Bacon's theory of 'forms' is borrowed from Scotus. Spinoza is deeply indebted to medieval Averroism, and to the philosophy of Maimonides. Even Locke attempts to revive the Scholastic experiential theory of knowledge, though in a crude shape. Kant's system is in closest touch with medieval theories, and some portions of his critical philosophy as, for example, his Cosmological Antinomies, at once bring to mind allied medieval discussions. The truth is that though medieval philosophy appeared to suffer an eclipse about the time of the Renaissance, and did in fact decline, still it is necessary to remember that its influence survived in a very real way. Its language and terminology had passed over largely into common speech; its view of the universe and of the meaning and purpose of human striving, passed current, not merely in the work of professional philosophers, but in the philosophical substratum

¹ *The Revival of Scholastic Philosophy*, p. 19.

of literature which represents the thought of the cultivated men of each period. The very success of Scholastic modes of thought and their universal diffusion are apt to conceal from us their originality and historical importance. The categories of this philosophy have grown into the very fibres of our minds. And if you realize, as I am sure you do, that the most important thing in any man is the philosophy of life to which he adheres, you will appreciate the delicacy of the compliment I pay you, when I suggest that almost all of you here present (the possible exception being a few who may be sophisticated by some recent form of pseudo-philosophy), hold strongly by a system of beliefs borrowed from Scholastic Philosophy. Nor is this by any means due to a happy accident. You have simply succeeded to the Scholastic view of the world and of the nature of reality through the process known as social inheritance. Almost every Christian nowadays is born a Thomist. Not that I would accuse you of the weakness, or shall I say impertinence, of attempting to be professional philosophers—you likely cling to the *results* rather than to the *processes* of speculation, and are enthusiastic for theories which you would not be prepared to rationally validate.

And now I have unhappily reached the most difficult question with which I have to deal in this paper. What is Scholastic Philosophy? Since this question cannot decently be avoided and yet could only be satisfactorily answered by intruding into your leisure moments with a number of bulky volumes, I can at present only do my best in very difficult circumstances. Philosophy nowadays is often divided into Logic, Metaphysics, and Ethics. It is a radically bad division, only tenable *stultitia hominum*, but it may be accepted here just for purposes of convenience. Possibly you are not wildly enthusiastic about logical problems, so we need not pause to consider them. The structure of Logic, indeed; is Scholastic through and through, and I need not urge (in Belfast of all places) that anyone who has appreciated the rare worth of *Barbara, Celarent*, has reason to be grateful to the Pope! Metaphysics however, raises questions of more general interest. Metaphysics

is the subject which attempts to explain the nature of reality, to sketch out a world-theory. It is the most abstract of all sciences aiming at the highest and most complete unity of knowledge. Whereas the particular sciences treat each of some special and limited portion of experience, metaphysics deals with those ultimate aspects of reality which underlie them all—with being and essence and causality, and such-like thought-provoking notions. Roughly speaking, there are three metaphysical problems of deepest interest—the Ego, the World, and God. Around these three problems speculation has centred from the beginning, and it is generally possible to place a system of philosophy, to get some idea of what it is like, of its metaphysical affiliation (as we may say), from the position it adopts upon these three fundamental problems. For example, English philosophical systems at the present time almost universally dispense altogether with the third member of the above division, namely, God; they have no place for such a being in their scheme of reality. Their contention in fact is the same as that which Nietzsche sums up in the decidedly neat if somewhat horrifying formula: 'God is dead.' Remember, I am not now suggesting that these theories are incorrect, I am merely anxious to state the facts.¹ Some persons, no doubt, regard such speculations merely as a form of 'mental gymnastics,' but they overlook the rather obvious point that such gymnastics may require contortions possible only to a moral invertebrate.² It may be urged that the Neo-Kantian school represented by such

¹ The extent to which Theistic modes of thought have vanished from philosophical literature in the English-speaking world is not often realized. An excellent illustration of this will be found in the late Professor James's work, *A Pluralistic Universe*. After summing up generally the relative values of Theistic and Pantheistic modes of thought, much to the disparagement of the former, he proceeds: 'Assuredly most members of this audience are ready to side with Hinduism in this matter. Those of us who are sexagenarians have witnessed in our own persons one of these gradual mutations of intellectual climate, due to innumerable influences, that make the thought of a past generation seem as foreign to its successor as if it were the expression of a different race of men. The theological machinery that spoke so livingly to our ancestors . . . sounds as odd to most of us as if it were some outlandish savage religion.'—*A Pluralistic Universe*, p. 29.

² See *Proceedings before the Committee*, p. 27.

thinkers as Green or Mr. Bradley, gives a very important place to what it calls the Absolute. True, but as the late Professor James remarks in his brilliant Hibbert Lectures,¹ the Absolute is totally unlike what the ordinary Christian man means by God, and if the Christian man is not aware of the difference when he studies these philosophers, this simply comes from the fact that keen logical discrimination is lamentably uncommon.

The Scholastic system may now be traced in outline. It is a system of philosophical Pluralism. The complete identity of the Absolute and the world that somehow proceeds from it, and yet is intimately transfused and united with its being, is the central doctrine of all systems of Monism. Temperamentally they seek to satisfy the so-called æsthetic or mystic craving for complete unity or intimacy with the ultimately real. When confronted with this momentous alternative of Monism or Pluralism, Thomism is entirely pluralistic. God is distinct from creation. Our human personalities too do not sink back into the all-devouring being of the Absolute,

When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turns again home.

We have an ultimate and inalienable distinctness. The dualism of God, who is *actus purus*, and of creatures that are in a mingled way *potentia* and *actus*, makes Scholasticism the foe of all kinds of Pantheism. The composition of matter and form of such vital importance in Scholastic Cosmology, of individual and universal upon which theory of knowledge depends, the distinction between the knowing subject with its states and the known object, between the soul-substance and God, are all theories incompatible with Monism. The theodicy of Scholasticism is creationist as opposed to any theory of unfolding or development or emanation ; its God is a personal being of infinite perfection whose existence can be proved by rational argument. Here it is opposed to Kantism. The relation of the world

¹ *A Pluralistic Universe*, pp. 110-111.

to God's creative mind is conceived on the lines of the Augustinian theory of Exemplarism, which is itself a modification of the Platonic theory of ideas, making God's mind 'the place of ideas,' which he freely realizes in creation. From another point of view the world is interpreted from an evolutionistic or teleological standpoint. It is a designed system of development (dynamism) not a merely mechanical arrangement. The Psychology of the Scholastics is spiritualistic as opposed to materialistic or positivistic. It maintains the existence of a rational spirit. Recent theories adopt various lines of interpretation, sometimes resting upon the bodily mechanism, or again allowing the psychical facts to float about loosely in the void (to use an illustration of the Berlin professor, Rehmke), like the heavenly bodies in space. Scholasticism insists upon the unity of the human personality. The most fashionable recent view may be summed up in a phrase. 'I am told,' says Clerk-Maxwell, 'that I shall soon have to believe myself to be a multiplicity of plastidule souls.' Our consciousness thus seems a corporate consciousness integrated out of particles of 'mind-dust.' 'It may be that our consciousness is after all nothing but the aggregate consciousnesses of the nation of individual cells of which we consist.' To this division into multiplex personalities Scholasticism opposes the essential unity of the self. In method Scholastic Psychology is experimental rather than *a priori* or idealistic, in this matter more in sympathy perhaps with the method of Wundt than with the purely introspective method of the Herbartians.¹

With regard to the perception of the world, the Schol-

¹ Here I may notice, in passing, the objection that Scholastic Philosophy is not sufficiently up to date. The philosophical aspects of this objection I shall touch upon later. The fact is, however, that to one who, like myself, finds a certain charm in antiquity, Scholasticism is painfully up to date. I may mention that in the purely Thomistic University of Louvain, a psychological laboratory was established before such a step had been taken in any university in France. England did not follow for many years. Obviously if the term up-to-date is rigidly confined to the rather inept type of human being, for he can scarcely be called a philosopher, that is enthusiastic only for the latest form of philosophical unorthodoxy, then the Scholastic may claim the privilege of not being up-to-date.

astic is what has been called a 'Natural Dualist.' He is opposed to all forms of subjective Idealism. He believes in the extra-mental or trans-perceptual existence of what is ordinarily called the external world, as opposed to the purely perceptual or mental existence ascribed to it by such thinkers as Berkeley or Green. The Scholastic theory of knowledge is at once empirical and rational. All knowledge starts with sense-perception, but does not end there. There are no innate ideas. Science is built up upon the basis of experience. The criterion of truth is logical evidence. The ethical view of St. Thomas is founded on the idea of God as the final destiny of man—the 'tota simul et perfecta possessio' of Boëthius. His theory is eudæmonistic in the Aristotelian sense. Free-will, responsibility, duty, are the central conceptions of his moral theory, which also enters into a minute analysis of the passions and virtues, and gives an admirable account of the notion of 'Law' and its relation to the moral end. On the question of our knowledge of the moral law Thomism is what would nowadays be called a system of 'Philosophical Intuitionism.'

SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

I might enter into all these points at much greater length, but perhaps I have said enough to map out the ground in a general way. And now we meet a question which has excited some interest, and revealed, I am forced to add, most abysmal and ostentatious ignorance in recent times. What, you will ask me, is the relation between this Scholastic Philosophy and Catholic Theology? It has been maintained, with wearying and unenlightened iteration, that Scholastic Philosophy and Catholic Theology are one and the same thing, that they are not really distinct, and that the purpose of Scholastic Philosophy is simply to establish the dogmas of the Catholic Church.¹ Now this statement is not merely untrue, it is violently and aggressively false. The question obviously may be considered

¹ See *Proceedings*, passim.

from two points of view, either from the point of view of philosophy or from that of the teaching of the Catholic Church. The Scholastic position is briefly this. Philosophy and theology differ both in their subject-matter and in their method. Theology studies the supernatural order as revealed in the word of God; philosophy studies the natural order by the light of reason. They differ altogether in principles and in constructive method. The study of dogma rests on the word of God, and on authority and tradition if these principles are acknowledged; the rational study of the universe rests on scientific demonstration and on this alone. As St. Thomas tells us in the very first chapter of his *Summa Theologica* these studies differ not merely *specifically* but *generically*. They belong to entirely different spheres. The process of 'dipping' into Scholastic Philosophy, in which many local people profess to have indulged, must have stopped short rather early, for they do not seem to have arrived at the first chapter of the *Summa Theologica*. Can it be that the mellow old wine of Scholasticism mounted so rapidly to the heads of these unskilled students? Again in the *Contra Gentiles*¹ we are told with an emphasis that should penetrate almost any prejudice: 'Aliter considerat de creaturis philosophus et aliter theologus'—'the philosopher and the theologian have quite a different way of reasoning concerning creatures.' The distinctive dogmas of Christianity fall within the supernatural sphere and cannot be demonstrated by reason. St. Thomas, for example, tells us concerning the mystery of the Trinity: 'Impossibile est per rationem naturalem ad cognitionem Trinitatis divinarum personarum pervenire . . . qui autem probare nititur Trinitatem personarum naturali ratione fidei derogat.'² 'It is impossible by natural reason to arrive at a knowledge of the Trinity of divine persons . . . he who attempts to prove a trinity of persons by natural reason takes away from the value of faith.' The same is true of the Incarnation, of Original Sin, of the Redemption,

¹ Bk. ii. ch. iv.

² *Summ. Theol.*, i., q. 32, ad 1.

of the Sacraments, and so on. Even the beginning of the world in time is regarded as known only by faith. ('Mundum incepisse aut durationis initium habuisse sola fide tenetur.') Some people apparently fancy that the Scholastic philosopher (unhappy man) spends his leisure moments in the delightful (though unrewarded) occupation of proving the eternal and immutable value of the Episcopacy by the pure light of reason; or demonstrating from the logical principles of the Cosmos the existence of Purgatory; or establishing the primacy of Peter independently of Scripture and tradition by a simple consideration of the nature of reality!

The truth is that there is nowadays a complete consensus of expert opinion upon this question of the distinction between philosophy and theology in the Scholastic system. I do not desire to weary you with quotations, but perhaps you will allow me to refer you to two of the most eminent historians of philosophy—both, in so far as anything definite can be gleaned about the religious opinions of a philosopher—apparently Protestants. Professor Windleband of Heidelberg tells us:—

Thus Scholasticism in this its highest point was far from identifying philosophy and theology, or from making the task of the former an unresting comprehension of dogma. . . . In Scholasticism at its height the distinction between natural and revealed theology was always kept in mind, and was drawn the more sharply the more the Church had occasion to guard against the confusion of its doctrine with natural theology.¹

And Ueberweg, professor at the University of Königsberg, a university in his time of an ultra-Protestant type, is still more explicit in dealing with the opinion of St. Thomas:—

This Thomistic distinction between the teaching of reason concerning God and the teachings of revelation continued prevalent (although opposed by Raymundus Lullius and others), and was even more strongly emphasized in the later periods of Scholasticism by the Nominalists. It appears also in the post-

¹ *History of Philosophy*, p. 321.

Scholastic period . . . in the schools of Descartes, Locke, and Leibniz, until the Critical Philosophy of Kant withdrew not only the trinity but as well the unity of the divine person from the sphere of doctrines susceptible of theoretical or rational demonstration, and relegated all conviction respecting God and divine things to the province of mere faith—faith not indeed in the teachings of revelation, but in the postulates of the moral consciousness—while the schools of Schelling and Hegel again vindicated the right of the doctrine of the Trinity, speculatively modified or interpreted, to a place in rational theology. In this—but on the basis of Catholic Christianity—the latter were imitated by Günther and his disciples, who excluded from the sphere of reason only the historical mysteries of Christianity, but failed to ^{or}_{it} secure the approbation of the ecclesiastical authorities.¹

Thus it is clear that whilst Thomism kept the spheres of philosophy and theology rigidly distinct, modern philosophy (in the schools of Schelling and Hegel) has tended to identify them! Ueberweg also informs us that the Thomistic distinction is that generally followed by Protestant theologians!

But, it may be objected, the Catholic Church perhaps does not agree with St. Thomas upon this essential point. Surely the Church maintains that its deposit of faith can be proved to demonstration by the subtle reasonings of Scholastic Philosophy? I do not desire to carry you far into the realms of theological science, nor is it indeed necessary to do so. The phrase of Pascal is apt: 'Qu'ils apprennent au moins, quelle est la religion qu'ils combattent avant de la combattre.' I shall quote for you an authority which, even in Belfast, may very well be accepted as defining the position of the Catholic Church. I refer to the Vatican Council. If ever in your literary wanderings you should come across a volume of its proceedings, and if you possess the happy power of reading Latin, which many persons who professed to have 'dipped' into Scholastic Philosophy apparently did not possess, turn, for the sake of an old controversial memory to Session iii. chapter iv.

¹ *History of Philosophy*, Eng. trans., vol. i. pp. 443-4.

section 13, and you will find the following momentous words :—

Si quis dixerit, in revelatione divina, nulla vera et proprie dicta mysteria contineri, sed universa fidei dogmata posse per rationem rite excultam e naturalibus principiis intelligi et demonstrari, anathema sit.

If anyone will say that in divine revelation there are contained no true mysteries properly so called, but that all the dogmas of faith can be understood and demonstrated from natural principles by reason if correctly cultivated, let him be anathema.

SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY AND AUTHORITY

I now pass on to consider the amazing assertion (to which the Scotch expert before referred to rather naïvely adhered) that the Thomistic criterion of truth is authority.¹ This is a statement which might well occasion a deep philosophic merriment, were it not that many otherwise honest people really seem to believe it. There naturally occurs to one in this connexion an admirable phrase from a well-known Scholastic of the twelfth century, Alanus de Insulis, which sums up our general position, not without a little playful irony: 'Quia auctoritas cereum habet nasum, id est, in diversum potest flecti sensum, rationibus roborandum est.' Since authority has a waxen nose, that is,

¹ *Proceedings*, p. 35. Professor Seth, apparently in entire innocence of historical fact, informs us: 'Philosophy in this large and comprehensive sense taught according to the principles of Thomas Aquinas is, in my judgment, inseparable from Theology, inasmuch as the fundamental principle of Thomas Aquinas is the principle of authority, or the principle of faith, the principle that Philosophy is subordinate to Theology, and that all its conclusions must be tested by the touchstone, the standard of truth that is given by the Church in its dogmas.' Apparently Professor Seth never heard of St. Peter Damian and the mystical and anti-scientific movement with which he was identified and to which Thomism is opposed. M. De Wulf, in an interesting article in the *Revue Philosophique*, vol. liii., Jan.-Jun., 1902, tells us in this connexion: 'On a beaucoup abusé d'une formule historique: *philosophia ancilla theologiae*, qui semble enlever à la philosophie toute indépendance d'action. Il n'est pas sans intérêt de rappeler que son auteur—P. Damiani, qui écrivit au xi siècle—était un de ces nombreux théologiens à outrance qui déclaraient la guerre à toute philosophie. L'origine de la formule est suspecte et elle traduit fort mal la conception des scolastiques' (p. 636). Again, consider the following appalling statement of the Professor: 'Mr. Wilson, K.C.—Now, if it were possible to take out of the teaching of Thomas Aquinas all his theology and dogma, including the dogma that the teachings of the Catholic Church are true and the ultimate criterion of truth, what portion of his philosophy

since its meaning can be twisted in a variety of ways, appeal must be made in addition to the light of reason. And St. Thomas tells us¹ that the worst argument that can be used in a philosophical discussion is authority. The well-known phrase of Boëthius, 'Locus ab auctoritate est infirmissimus,' was a commonplace in medieval times. As a matter of philosophical temperament, indeed, the Neo-Scholastic is, in philosophical matters, remarkably free from that reverence for authority which often seems to be almost the entire mental outfit of the modern student. Who has not met the youthful enthusiast (he makes one hopeful in the inherent altruism of human nature) who, with a fine faith, stakes his little intellectual fortune on the authority of Kant or Green, of Wundt or Mr. Bradley? Despise him not, for he gains this much at least that he is equipped against his more independent-minded brethren with an admirable appeal *ad verecundiam!* Even in theological questions, St. Thomas tells us that although authority is an argumentative weapon of great value it requires skilled use, since certain persons, as, for example, pagans (of whom we have many and increasing varieties in our day),

do not agree with us regarding the authority of any written testament by which they can be convinced; as, for example,

would be left?' Professor Seth—'Simply the Aristotelian element in it, the part that he has borrowed from Aristotle, which is, of course, a very considerable part' (*Proceedings*, p. 38). Elsewhere he tells us: 'I have no desire to underestimate the importance, the historical importance, of Thomas Aquinas, which, I think, is exceedingly great' (*ibid.*, p. 37). The influence of Aristotelianism upon medieval philosophy, though wide and deep, may easily be overestimated. The influence of St. Augustine was perhaps upon the whole, still deeper. His thought was the living spirit of the philosophy of the time, the *form* to the Aristotelian *matter*. So thinks Dr. Karl Werner, in the introduction to his work, *Der Endausgang der mittelalterlichen Scholastik*. M. Picavet, Director of Medieval Philosophical Studies in the Sorbonne, has arrived at the conclusion that Neo-Platonic influence was throughout predominant in medieval philosophy. Père Mandouret has an admirable treatment of the question in his recent book on Siger of Brabant. I merely mention these opinions to indicate the complexity of the problem which our Professor solves in so light-hearted a fashion. Moreover, if Aquinas did not do some philosophical thinking for himself, it is difficult to understand where his 'historical importance' can come in. However, as Professor Seth's acquaintance with medieval philosophy is, on his own confession, confined to an English translation of the ethical portions of the *Summa Theologica*, he cannot be taken seriously.

¹ *Summ. Theol.*, i., q. I., art. viii., ad 2.

we can argue against the Jews by means of the old Testament, against heretics by means of the New Testament. These, however, respect the *authority* of neither the one nor the other. Hence it is necessary to have recourse to natural reason, to which all must necessarily assent, which, however, in divine things does not carry us very far.¹

St. Thomas, in fact, had the keenest and most refined appreciation of the precise scope and limits of the argument from authority. It is gravely to be feared, even if it can only be very delicately hinted, that in all this matter many persons are suffering from the not uncommon complaint of having first strongly made up their minds, on the ground of the general iniquity of the Roman Church, and then set out upon the unprofitable search for unattainable evidence.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

The objection is sometimes strongly urged (more especially by ministers of religion) that the Scholastic philosophers, whatever else may be said about them, were undoubtedly keenly interested in religious problems, and that this interest inevitably produced a bias in the orthodox direction in their philosophical speculations. Historically it is no doubt true that medieval thinkers were deeply interested in the truth of the Christian religion. And speaking as a later-day Scholastic, I am glad to confess to the same weakness. The contention, however, that this renders their philosophical theories merely theology, or that it in some way interferes with their fairness of mind, their honesty, their determination to face facts or to adopt certain theories, raises most delicate philosophical issues.²

¹ 'Non conveniunt nobiscum in *auctoritate* alicujus scripturae, per quam possunt convinci; sicut Contra Judaeos disputare possumus per Vetus Testamentum; contra haereticos per Novum. Hi vero neutrum recipiunt. Unde necesse est ad naturalem rationem recurrere cui omnes assentire coguntur; quae tamen in rebus divinis deficiens est.'—*Contra Gentiles*, bk. i., ch. ii.

² 'Man muss den Mut haben, es klar zu sagen: Eigentlich gesprochen, gibt es keine katholische Philosophie . . . jener Ausdruck ist . . . einfach als falsch und schädlich zu verwerfen; er leistet manchen Missverständnissen und vor allem der Anklage Vorschub, Männer des Glaubens könnten sich nicht ernstlich, frei und ungehindert den rein natürlichen Wissenschaften widmen.'—Dr. Karl Sentroul, *Was ist Neu-scholastische Philosophie?* p. 30.¶

The fact is that a man must approach philosophical problems with some peculiar temperament of mind and body, and never without a complex system of beliefs. Philosopher A is married, inhabits a West End flat, is bilious, and strikes out an ingenious line of speculation in favour of Pessimism; B, living in a monastery, in robust health, pins his faith upon Optimism, pitches his tent and stakes out his philosophic claim in that hopeful region; C comes to the study of philosophical problems to rid the world of the heavy incubus of Christianity, 'strepitum Acherontis avari'; while D, who is not without the inspiration of Christian hope, madly plunges into the gulf of conflicting theories because the intolerable temper of his mother-in-law renders it a luxury to spend his afternoons in the library of the British Museum. Are we to be compelled to take all these circumstances into account in judging of their philosophical systems? Must I discount D's admirable theory of the sympathetic emotions because of his unhappy relations with his mother-in-law combined with his belief in Christianity, or refuse to consider B's theory of Optimism because I am opposed to monastic institutions? The fact that Kant was a prosy and rather narrow-minded old bachelor, and by faith a Lutheran, does not affect the validity of the Categorical Imperative. Nor can we neglect the Hegelian philosophy on the ground that a man who seriously regarded himself as a world-event may have been perilously near to insanity. If it is a disadvantage in Hegel that he would have been glad to justify Christianity with Hegelian modifications, surely it cannot be an advantage in Spencer or Nietzsche that they would gladly have dispensed with it. Everyone who deals with philosophical problems comes to them inextricably involved in a psycho-physiological climate. The same is true of scientific problems of all kinds. We should not doubt the law of gravitation if Newton had been a dipsomaniac. Philosophical theories must be judged by the evidence that can be produced in their favour. If we are to wait until some philosopher turns up who can start upon his enquiries without the disturbing presence of any

previous beliefs, and who in addition is entirely free from the embarrassing influence of environment, our pilgrimage must be prolonged *in saecula saeculorum*. When the desired individual did finally arrive we should find that we had been mistaken in our ideal, and had confused fairness of mind with intellectual vacuity. A philosopher devoid of preconceptions is at best an unattainable ideal; at worst, a psychological monstrosity. The most we can expect from any thinker is, not at all to be free from preconceptions but to be eager for the truth, and it is unnecessary for me to insist that Christianity has done inestimable service to philosophy and to science generally by the value it placed upon truth always and in all things.

THE SCIENTIFIC MIND AND NEO-SCHOLASTICISM

To the scientific mind a genuine feeling of difficulty may arise in connexion with the idea of resuscitating an old-time system of philosophy. The inappropriateness of such a procedure is not so much clearly realized as vaguely felt. Nor is it that the mere fact of antiquity, of a noble pedigree for our beliefs, directly presents itself as a disadvantage. The difficulty really springs from the application of the concept of evolutionary development to the sphere of philosophic truth. Viewed from this standpoint systems of philosophy are regarded as intellectual reactions upon complex environmental conditions. Adaptation to this complex environment consequently appears to be one of their unfailing qualities. And it seems impossible that systems of thought which have been shaped and framed amid one set of environmental conditions could just fit another set, could be responsive with sufficient delicacy to the constantly varying intellectual needs of new orders of society. I am inclined to think that some such reasoning as this is not unfrequently present in the minds of cultivated men, and that it constitutes for them an almost insuperable difficulty in connexion with the Neo-Scholastic movement. And yet the intricacy of the epistemological problems that such a line of objection raises can scarcely be said to be adequately realized.

It might seem a sufficient answer to such a line of objection to point out that Neo-Scholasticism is not a revival in the precise sense that this objection contemplates. I have already remarked that Thomism never ceased to be a living philosophy, and moreover, 'Thomism is not St. Thomas stereotyped in minutest detail; it is the acceptance of a definite world-view with the principles and methods that give it articulate and rejuvenescent expression.'¹ The very motto of the Neo-Scholastics of Louvain, 'Vetera et Nova,' and the fact that in that university philosophy is studied in the closest connexion with the special sciences, would perhaps be sufficient to show that our philosophy is keenly sensitive to the present-day intellectual and social climate. But the supposed difficulties raised by the general evolution point of view in the sphere of philosophy require the most careful consideration.

'There is something positively terrible,' says Mr. Birrell, in a delightful essay on Cardinal Newman, 'in this natural history of opinion. All the passion and the pleading of a life, the thought and the labour, the sustained argument, the library of books, reduced to what?—a series of accidents.' The wide range of scepticism that this idea introduces is seldom realized. Its effort is really directed not to explain truth, but to explain it away. Truth becomes mental accommodation to changing environment. The thinker and his most cherished beliefs are simply the outcome of the varied incidence of complex forces. When held with a full force of conviction, however, the theory has a happy reactive effect. It is unnecessary to urge that, if valid at all, it is destructive of other systems of philosophy as well as of Neo-Scholasticism. If its general outlook upon belief be true, it must inevitably follow that present-day systems of belief are open to precisely the same difficulties as previous systems. They, too, form part of a stream of tendency; they are simply complex responses to our present environment; they can lay no claim to finality, for with the changing of the environment they will be subject to

¹ E. T. Shanahan, in Baldwin's *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, article on St. Thomas.

change. They cannot, in fact, be regarded as absolutely true. Even the theory itself that truth is an accommodation to the environment cannot be true, for is it not after all merely a response to present conditions, and when these change, as they undoubtedly will change, the theory will be found to be no longer responsive.

It is not without interest to notice that this idea of accommodation to environment is plausible only so long as we consider theories so to speak in the bulk. When we proceed to apply it to particular truths we at once perceive that its supposed significance vanishes. The disastrous effects of environmental changes upon the Principle of Contradiction, or upon such truths as that two and two are four, need not occasion any acute fear. The progress of science is a fact of which every living system of philosophy must take account. But the effects of this progress upon metaphysical problems may very easily be exaggerated. The greater philosophical problems spring, so to speak, from the relatively permanent aspects of reality. The problems presented by the contingency of the universe, or by the universal character of knowledge, or by the concept of causality, can scarcely be essentially modified by future progress. It is just as necessary to insist upon the permanency of such problems as upon their liability to change. Moreover, if such drastic mutations are possible this is as much a difficulty for one form of philosophy as for another.¹

CONCLUSION

The question of the value of Scholastic Philosophy would demand a more detailed and elaborate treatment than I can give it in this paper. In a note in his diary that admirably cautious thinker, the late Professor Sidgwick,

¹ Huxley has an interesting reference to an analogous difficulty in the religious sphere: 'There is a great deal of talk and not a little lamentation about the so-called religious difficulties which physical science has created. In theological science, as a matter of fact, it has created none. Not a solitary problem presents itself to the philosophical theist at the present day which has not existed from the time that philosophers began to think out the logical grounds and the logical consequences of theism.'
—*Life and Letters of Charles Darwin.*

gives us his idea of Thomism. The entry is as follows: 'Read Gass's *Christliche Ethik*, and wondered in what age of the world I should have had most chance of being a Christian; decided in favour of the thirteenth century—supposing I could have been a pupil of Thomas Aquinas.'¹ This from the keenest and most critical English philosopher of recent times. I quite admit, however, that the advantages of being a Christian do not appeal to minds of a certain mould. Naturally as Scholastic Philosophy is the form of philosophy to which I myself adhere, it seems to me to have that unique value which always attaches to the truth. But even from the point of view of an outsider, the Neo-Scholastic movement must appear one of the most important philosophical movements in the Europe of our time. To one brought up in the still somewhat narrow insularity of British philosophy, I confess that it may not be easy to realize this, though many English writers have realized it. British philosophers at the present time are, roughly speaking, divided into two camps—the one professing a type of Hegelianism long since defunct upon the Continent, and the other following out heroically, though with much self-adulation, a type of the older English empiricism modified by evolutionism, which in its results is not so much a rational system of philosophy as a voluntarist faith. Neither of these lines of speculation can be said to have produced much stir among Continental thinkers. Neo-Scholasticism has become an important influence. Admirably adapted as it is to serve as the philosophy of science, it is strong where idealistic systems are weakest. One can gauge the strength of Scholasticism in Germany from the eminence of the men who have taken the field against it—such men as Professor Paulsen, of Berlin, and Professor Eucken, of Jena. Some persons apparently think that the Queen's University has, so to speak, taken a *salto mortale* in this matter—'rushed in where angels (bad angels, of course, are meant) fear to tread.' But the fact is that Scholastic Philosophy is taught expressly in very many Continental universities—in such

¹ *Henry Sidgwick: A Memoir*, p. 446.

famous seats of learning as Bonn, Breslau, Munich, Würzburg, Freiburg, Münster, Braunberg, Vienna, Buda-Pesth, Amsterdam. In the Sorbonne, Père Gardair lectures on the philosophy of Aquinas; in the Protestant University of Amsterdam, a Dominican friar, Père de Groot, lectures on the same subject. In Oxford, I understand, Scholastic Philosophy can be taken in the course for 'Greats.'¹ At the present time there are, perhaps, more reviews and periodicals dealing with Neo-Scholasticism alone than are issued on philosophical topics generally in the entire English-speaking world.

It is necessary to bring this rather disconnected paper to a conclusion. There are many aspects of the subject upon which I have not been able to touch even superficially. I did not consider myself called upon to deal with the general question of religion and philosophy in any detail, for this is a problem that confronts every philosopher who is obliging enough to believe in any sort of religion, and, moreover, it is a problem old enough now to make it extremely difficult to say anything new with profit. Neither did I feel myself called upon to vindicate the intellectual and artistic eminence of medieval times, for Neo-Scholasticism is a philosophy of the present, and must be judged by the manner in which it deals with present problems. Moreover, with the exception of a hopelessly uncultivated few, whose minds are aureoled with bigotry, and who cling fondly to the 'blinded Papist' view, this eminence is nowadays acknowledged. I cannot end this paper better than with a quotation from a writer to whose opinions his wide range of intellectual activity and extensive knowledge of European literature give very great authority. Professor Saintsbury in his admirable *History of Criticism* tells us of the Middle Ages:—

Abused and extolled as 'Ages of Faith' they were really ages of a mixture of logical argument and playful half-scepticism.

¹ A masterly treatment of this aspect of the matter will be found in Dr. Hogan's evidence before the Robertson Commission, Third Report, pp. 211 et seq.

Regarded with scorn as 'Ages of Ignorance,' they knew what they did know thoroughly, which is more than can be said of some others. Commiserated as Ages of Misery, they were probably the happiest times of the world, putting Arcadia and Fairyland out of sight. Patronised as ages of mere preparation, they accomplished things that we have toiled after in vain for some five hundred years. They have in the rarest cases been really understood even historically.¹

D. O'KEEFFE.

¹ *History of Criticism*, vol. i., pp. 372-3.

IRELAND IN THE GENERAL ELECTIONS

(1826—1911)

A SURVEY of the General Elections from 1826 to 1911, and of what came of them, may be opportune at the present moment. 'Progress is in a straight line,' says Lamennais, 'to find this line it is necessary to go back to the past.' I fix on 1826, as it was then that the Parliament which finally granted Catholic Emancipation was elected, and the 'Concession' of Catholic Emancipation is an epoch in the history of these islands. The subject is instructive and interesting; it is full of surprises. We find Tories doing things which they were never expected to do, and Liberals not doing things which it was hoped they would accomplish. I once heard the question asked, 'What is the difference between a Whig and a Tory?' The answer given was, 'One is bad, and the other damned bad.' The story of the General Elections, 1826-1911, will, so far as Ireland at all events is concerned, justify the definition.

The General Election of 1826 was fought mainly on the Catholic Question; and, says Sir Spencer Walpole, 'it afforded a decisive proof of the dislike which the English people have always felt to make any concessions to Rome.' In 1828 the Government of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel was formed, practically pledged not to grant Catholic Emancipation. In 1829 they granted it. It is worth while to summarize the events which led up to this surrender. In March, 1827, Sir Robert Peel said in the House of Commons: 'To admit Catholics within the walls of the House of Commons would be dangerous to the Constitution, would lead to interference in every election between landlord and tenant, and would increase discord and dissension.'

At the opening of Parliament in 1828 the subject of Ireland was not so much as mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. On May 8, Sir Robert Peel spoke and voted

against Sir Francis Burdett's motion, 'That it is the opinion of this House that it is expedient to consider the state of the Laws affecting His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects.' In June, O'Connell was elected for Clare. In the autumn five-sixths of the infantry force of the 'United Kingdom' were employed in keeping the peace in Ireland. In February, 1829, Peel introduced a Bill for the Emancipation of the Catholics. On April 10 it passed the Lords, 'and became law.' Well has it been said, 'In politics few things ever happen except the unforeseen.'

The next General Election was in 1830. The question of the hour was Parliamentary Reform. Dr. Doyle had written to O'Connell, in effect, saying that complete justice to Ireland would never be granted by an unreformed Parliament, and advising him to throw himself heart and soul into the Reform movement, which O'Connell did.

After the Election Wellington still remained in office, and asserted that the House of Commons needed no reform. Curiously enough, it was on the motion of an Irishman—Sir Henry Parnell—that the Tory Government was ultimately overthrown. On November 15 Parnell moved that the Civil List Estimates be referred to a Select Committee. Ministers opposed the motion, which was, however, carried by a majority of 29 (233 to 204). The Government resigned, and Lord Grey became Prime Minister. The second reading of the first Reform Bill was, as Mr. Lecky has often said, carried (March 21, 1831) in the Commons by the Irish vote. But it was lost in Committee. Parliament was dissolved.

The General Election took place in April, 1831. The Whigs triumphed at the polls. Lord Grey remained Prime Minister. The second reading of the second Reform Bill was carried in the Commons by a majority of 136. But the second reading was rejected in the Lords by a majority of 41. The Commons immediately passed a resolution adhering to the principle and leading provisions of the Bill, and expressing their confidence in the Ministry. In October Parliament was prorogued. The Speech from the Throne declared that in the next Session the question of Reform

should be paramount. Parliament re-assembled in December, 1831. The Third Reform Bill was immediately introduced, and carried successfully through the Commons. In April, 1832, it was read a second time in the Lords, and was carried by a majority of 9. The Bill was, however, soon lost in Committee. In May, 1832, the Government advised the King to create a sufficient number of peers to ensure the safety of the measure. But the King refused to act on the advice of his Ministers, who at once resigned. The House of Commons voted an address to the King expressing their deep regret at this result, and imploring him 'to call to his counsels such persons only as would carry into effect, unimpaired in all its essential provisions,' the Reform Bill recently agreed to by the House. The King, however, had sent for the Duke of Wellington and authorized him to form an Administration. After consulting Peel and Lyndhurst, the Duke abandoned the task. Grey was recalled, and the King very reluctantly gave a *written* permission

to create such a number of Peers as will be sufficient to ensure the passing of the Reform Bill, first calling up Peers' eldest sons.

(Signed), WILLIAM R.

WINDSOR, *May 17, 1832.*

It was gall and wormwood to the King to have to sign this document; and he performed a strategic manœuvre to avoid the creation of new peers. He sent his private secretary to the Opposition advising them to remain away—(an irregular and unconstitutional procedure)—from the division, and so to save their faces, and let the Bill pass. They acted on this advice, and so the English Reform Bill became law. O'Connell and the Irish had supported the Reform movement all the time. What did the reformers do for Ireland? The Government of Lord Grey introduced and carried (1832) an Irish Reform Bill, which O'Connell and the Irish members denounced as quite inadequate, and which proved an utter fraud. In 1850 John Bright declared, in the House of Commons, that the 'Representation of Ireland was virtually extinguished.'

The last unreformed Parliament *was dissolved in*

December, 1832, and the first reformed Parliament met in January, 1833. Lord Grey still remained Prime Minister.

What did the first Reform Ministry do for Ireland? It passed the fiercest Irish Coercion Act, perhaps, ever placed on the English Statute Book. The Tithe Question was the question of the hour, but tithes were not abolished. Coercion, not redress, was the Irish policy of the first reformed Ministry. It was during the debates on Grey's Coercion Act that O'Connell denounced the Whigs as 'base, bloody, and brutal.' The day of retribution, however, soon came :—

The Coercion Act was to expire on August 1, 1834. Wellesley (the Viceroy), Littleton (Chief Secretary), and Brougham (Lord Chancellor), intrigued with O'Connell, behind Grey's back. But Althorp knew what was going on. Littleton met O'Connell; a bargain was struck between them. The Agitator was to support the Government, and the Coercion Act was to be dropped. Nevertheless, on July 1, Grey proposed the renewal of the Coercion Act in all its original rigour. O'Connell at once revealed to the House of Commons what had passed between himself and Littleton, and blew the Government to pieces. Littleton resigned, Althorp resigned, Grey resigned. The first Reform Ministry was dead within fifteen months of its birth. Ireland was the angel of destruction.

In July the Government was reconstructed under the Premiership of Lord Melbourne, but in November Melbourne himself was dismissed by the King, and Peel became Prime Minister.

In December Parliament was dissolved.

The General Election of January, 1835, made O'Connell 'master of the situation.' He held the balance between English Parties. What was he able to do? He was able to put the Whigs into office (by a majority of 60). Peel had introduced a Tithe Bill commuting tithes to a rent-charge of 75 per cent. of the tithes. O'Connell urged Lord John Russell to propose (as an amendment) that the surplus revenues of the English State Church in Ireland should be applied to purposes of general utility. Russell moved the Appropriation Clause, as it was called. Peel was beaten,

and Lord Melbourne became Prime Minister. The new Government introduced a Tithe Bill in 1835, commuting tithes to a rent-charge of 68 per cent. of the tithes, and containing the Appropriation Clause. The Bill passed the Commons, but the Appropriation Clause was thrown out by the Lords. Russell then dropped the Bill. It was sent up again to the Lords, in 1836, when the Appropriation Clause was again struck out, and the Bill again dropped by Russell.

In 1837 Russell introduced the Bill once more, minus the Appropriation Clause. It was read a second time in the Commons, then the death of the King necessitated a dissolution and the Tithe Bill came to an end. Most people now recognize that O'Connell ought not to have accepted the Tithe Bill minus the Appropriation Clause, and Lord Macaulay himself has said that Russell ought to have resigned when he failed to carry it; that is, when he was unable to fulfil his pledge. However, the Clause went by the board and was never revived. Up to 1837, O'Connell had gained nothing in legislation by being 'master of the situation.'

The General Election of 1837 made him once more the 'master of the situation.' Lord Melbourne was again kept in office by the Irish vote. What happened? Russell accepted, in 1838, the Tithe Bill which Peel had introduced in 1835. In 1838 he carried a Poor Law Bill over the heads of the Irish members, disregarding the recommendations of an Irish Commission. In 1840 he carried an Irish Municipal Franchise Bill, which Sir Erskine May has described as 'virtually a scheme of Municipal disfranchisement.'

The upshot of O'Connell's 'mastership' was, that he kept the Whigs in office from 1835 to 1841, enabling them to carry English measures of reform, but effecting little for Ireland. As an Irish legislative machine the Whig Governments of 1835-1837 were a fraud. There was, of course, the just administration of Thomas Drummond; but the just administration of any man is no recompense for the existence of bad laws, under which an unjust administration may, at any moment, spring into being. When the

Melbourne Government of 1835 came into office O'Connell wrote—

A new day begins to shine upon us—a new era opens for Ireland. An Administration is formed pledged, as well by its political principles as by its political interests, to do all we require—justice to the people of Ireland.

When the Melbourne Government fell, O'Connell declared that justice for Ireland could not be obtained from the English Parliament, and he at once unfurled the banner of Repeal.

The General Election of 1841 placed Sir Robert Peel in power. I have said that the story of these General Elections is full of 'surprises.' Sir Robert Peel's Government of 1841-46 was a 'surprise.' Sir Robert Peel had always been the enemy of Ireland. Even during the Melbourne Administrations (1835-1841) he had shown his anti-Irish spirit. But in 1841 he became, to all appearances, a reformed character. In 1843 he appointed the famous Devon Commission to enquire into the Land Question. The Commission reported in 1845 in favour of the claims of the tenants; and, in the same year, Lord Stanley introduced a Bill in the House of Lords practically to give effect to the recommendations of the Commission. That Tory Bill, introduced by a great Tory Minister, is now forgotten, but it is worth while to recall its provisions:—

The Bill proposed that tenants should be entitled to compensation, on disturbance, for prospective improvements of a permanent nature, made with the consent of the landlord; or, without his consent, provided the improvements had been effected with the authority and approval of a Commissioner of Improvements, to be specially appointed for the purpose. The functions of the Commissioner were to inspect the lands, and to examine and inquire whether they would 'bear' improvement; and, then, if he thought well of it, to authorize the works contemplated by the tenant, and to award, in case of eviction, such measure of compensation as was deemed fair and equitable;

Stanley made a vigorous fight for his Bill, which was

vehemently opposed by the Irish landlords led by Lord Londonderry and the Marquis of Clanrickarde. Stanley, nevertheless, carried the Bill through the second reading. It was then referred to a Select Committee, and lost. That such a Bill should have been introduced by a Tory Minister, in 1845, is a remarkable and significant fact. It illustrates the accuracy of the statement that Tories sometimes do things which we never expect them to do. But Peel's Liberal operations did not cease with the appointment of the Devon Commission and the introduction of Stanley's Land Bill. In 1844 he created the Board of Charitable Donations and Bequests (a 'concession to Catholics'). In 1844 he introduced a Reform Bill (which did not pass), reducing the £10 Freehold Franchise of 1829 to £5. In 1845 he increased the grant to Maynooth, and, generally, he recommended the appointment of Catholics to the public service. In 1846 Peel introduced a Coercion Bill. The Irish and Liberals and Protectionists combined to defeat it, and the Government was overthrown. In July, 1846, Lord John Russell became Prime Minister.

In 1847 Parliament was dissolved. The General Election which followed showed some curious results, thus:—

Conservatives	331
(a) Free Traders	105
(b) Protectionists	226
					331
Total	331
Liberals	325
					325
Conservative Majority	6

But the Conservative Free Traders supported the Liberals, and with the addition of the Irish Liberal vote, enabled Lord John Russell to hold office until 1852. Lord John Russell's first Irish act was the introduction of a Coercion Bill similar to that for the introduction of which he had combined with the Irish and Protectionists to drive Peel from office. The Bill was carried by a large majority. His next gift to Ireland was the Treason Felony Act of 1848. In 1849 the Encumbered Estates Act—a measure

which had the effect of introducing into Ireland a worse set of landlords (if that were possible) than had been there before, was passed. In 1850 a Parliamentary Franchise Bill (which, *inter alia*, embodied Peel's proposal of 1844) became law. In 1851 the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill—a measure of insult to the Catholic population of both islands—was passed. In February, 1852, the Government of Lord John Russell resigned, and Lord Derby became Prime Minister. In July Parliament was dissolved.

The General Election of 1852 left English parties equally balanced. 'When the elections were over,' says Sir Gavan Duffy, 'the Government (Lord Derby's) and the Opposition each claimed a majority. This was the precise result we (the Irish) had hoped and predicted, for now, plainly, the Irish vote would prove decisive.' In November, 1852, a Tenants Compensation Bill (giving compensation to tenants, on eviction, for improvements, prospective and retrospective) was introduced by the Irish Tory Attorney-General, and read a first time without opposition. In December it was read a second time without opposition, and referred to a Select Committee.

Then a crisis arose. A combination of parties in Opposition was formed to defeat the Government on Mr. Disraeli's Budget. The Irish were approached, and asked to join in the general attack. They declined on the ground that they would await the action of Ministers on the Tenants Compensation Bill.

There was an interview between some of the Irish members and a Cabinet Minister. The Irish agreed to support the Government, if Ministers would make the Tenants Compensation Bill and a Bill (introduced by an Ulsterman, Sharman Crawford) for securing the Tenant Right Custom in Ulster, and limiting the power of eviction in certain cases, Cabinet questions. The Minister seems to have given a satisfactory answer to these conditions. Rumour got abroad that the Government were going to abandon the landlords. Lord Roden asked Lord Derby, in the House of Lords, if the Government were about to accept the principles of the Land Bills which had been referred to a Select Committee. Lord Derby replied that

the Government would not, under any circumstances, accept the principle of Crawford's Bill; whereupon the Irish Party resolved to vote against the Government on the Budget. The result was that the Government fell by a majority of 19. 'Ten votes,' says Sir Gavan Duffy, 'transferred from the "ayes" to the "noes" would have saved them, and they would have had twenty such votes but for Lord Derby's declaration.'

The introduction of a Tenants Compensation Bill by the Tory Government of Lord Derby was one of those 'surprises' of which I have already spoken. It is a curious fact that up to 1852, indeed up to 1870, the two best Government Land Measures for Ireland were brought forward by Tory Ministers, one in 1845 and one in 1852. The Derby Ministry fell in December, 1852, and was succeeded by the Whig Administration of Lord Aberdeen. In February, 1853, the Select Committee, on the motion of Lord Palmerston and Sir John Young (two Whigs), rejected Crawford's Bill. It accepted the Tenants Compensation Bill, subject to certain alterations which did not improve the measure. This measure, as altered, passed the Commons in August, and was read a second time in the House of Lords, but finally dropped for the Session. Early in the ensuing Session it was again passed through the Commons; and on February 28, 1854, it was read a second time in the Lords. It was then referred to a Select Committee, condemned by the Committee, abandoned by the Government, and lost. So much for the Land Bill. In 1853 the income tax was extended to Ireland. In February, 1855, the Government of Lord Aberdeen resigned, and Lord Palmerston became Prime Minister. Lord Palmerston was the steady enemy of Ireland. His Government opposed Land Bills introduced in 1855 and in 1856. In the latter year, the English Chief Secretary in Ireland, Mr. Horsman, said that it would be a waste of time to go into Committee on a Bill for legalising and extending the Ulster custom.

In 1857 there was a General Election, and the Government of Lord Palmerston still retained the confidence of the constituencies. But in February, 1858, it was defeated

in the House of Commons, and Lord Derby became Prime Minister. Both English parties were now opposed to Land Reform, and a Tenants Compensation Bill, introduced by John Francis Maguire, was defeated in the House of Commons by 200 votes to 65. Upon that occasion Lord Palmerston said :—

The leading principle of this Bill is to transfer the property of one set of persons to another, and a different class. . . . A retrospective enactment, which transfers from the landlord to the tenant that which by law has hitherto been the property of the former, which both parties know, and have always known to have been their property—an Act which does this is, I conceive, most unjust, and ought not to be allowed.

In 1859 there was another General Election, and Lord Palmerston again became Prime Minister. In 1845, and in 1852, the Tories had introduced two good Bills to carry out the recommendations of the Devon Commission, and to give compensation to tenants for improvements. In 1860 the Government of Lord Palmerston carried a Bill which disregarded the recommendations of the Devon Commission, and enacted that the relation of landlord and tenant should be based on contract ; and that the tenant, while deprived of all claim on account of retrospective improvements, should not be entitled to compensation for even prospective improvements, if made without the landlord's consent. This was a reactionary measure, and would have done infinite harm if it had been carried out ; but, happily, it remained a dead letter. In 1862 the Chief Secretary was asked if the Government intended to introduce a Land Bill, and he replied that the Land Question ' was to be settled, not by political agitation, but by the course of events.' In 1863 the Chief Secretary again declared ' that the Act of 1860 had effected a final settlement of the long agitated question, and that the Government did not feel inclined to re-open it.' Finally, in 1865, Lord Palmerston uttered his famous dictum that ' Tenant Right is Landlord's wrong.' The Government of Lord Palmerston was not only opposed to Land Reform, but it was opposed to Church Reform ; the Home Secretary declaring, in the

House of Commons on March 28, 1865, that no 'practical grievance existed,' and that 'in attempting to redress the theoretical grievance, a great shock would be given to our laws and institutions.'

Lord Palmerston died in October, 1865, and Lord John Russell (now Earl Russell) became Prime Minister. We have seen that the Government of Lord Palmerston had declared, in 1863, that the Land Act of 1860 was a 'final' settlement of the Land Question. But, in 1866, the Government of Earl Russell declared that that enactment was unfair and unworkable.

Its principal provision, that the tenant, before improving, should ask the landlord's consent, was declared by Mr. Chichester Fortescue, to be 'an invitation to the landlord to dissent'; and the necessity of introducing another measure in the interests of the tenants was pronounced to be inevitable. But the new measure, introduced in 1866 (which recognized the tenant's right to the value of improvements made by him without the landlord's 'dissent') was generally opposed by the tenant party, who felt that such a provision would be an 'invitation to the landlord to dissent,' and by the landlord party, who were hostile to all measures of land reform; and ultimately abandoned by the Government.

In June, 1866, the Government of Earl Russell was defeated on the English Reform Bill in the House of Commons, and resigned. Lord Derby became Prime Minister. Once more there was a 'surprise.' In 1867 the Tory Government introduced a Land Bill which was more extreme than the Whig Bill of 1866. That Bill had provided that the tenant should receive compensation for improvements provided that the landlord had not forbidden him to make them.

But the Tory measure of 1867 proposed to withdraw from the landlord altogether the vetoing power with which the Whigs had invested him, and to appoint a 'Commissioner of Improvements,' who should stand between him and the tenants, and decide the issues raised by them respecting all questions of improvements. But the tenants would not accept this Bill. Twenty years previously they would have been satisfied with such a concession; they now held more advanced views. In 1845

they would have trusted to a 'Commissioner of Improvements,' but they would not trust to him in 1867; and, as a result of their opposition, combined with the opposition of the landlords, who regarded the Bill of 1867 with as much disfavour as the Bill of 1866, the measure was given up.

In February, 1868, Lord Derby resigned and Mr. Disraeli became Prime Minister. An Irish Reform Bill was passed.

In November, 1868, there was a General Election, and Mr. Gladstone became Prime Minister. In 1830 Dr. Doyle had said that if the English House of Commons was reformed justice would be done to Ireland. But from 1832 to 1868 not a single measure of any use to the masses of the Irish people was placed on the English Statute Book.

Whigs and Tories, Commons and Lords, were alike responsible for the misgovernment of the country. In 1866 Bright said:—

If I go back to the Ministers who have sat on the Treasury Bench since I first came into this House, Sir Robert Peel first, then Lord John Russell, then Lord Aberdeen, then Lord Derby, then Lord Palmerston, then Lord Derby again, then Lord Palmerston again, and now Earl Russell,—I say, that with regard to all these men, there has not been any approach to anything that history will describe as statesmanship on the part of the English Government towards Ireland. There were Coercion Bills in abundance,—Arms Bills, Session after Session,—lamentations like that of the right hon. gentleman, the Member for Buckinghamshire (Mr. Disraeli) that the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act was not made perpetual by a clause which, he laments, was repealed. There have been Acts for the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, like that which we are now discussing; but there has been no statesmanship. Men, the most clumsy and brutal, can do these things; but we want men of higher temper—men of higher genius—men of higher patriotism to deal with the affairs of Ireland.

In 1869, under the pressure of Fenianism, the English State Church in Ireland was disestablished and partly disendowed. In 1870 the best Land Act introduced by any Government up to that date was passed; but even the

Land Act of 1870 proved a failure. In 1872 vote by ballot was adopted.

In 1874 there was another General Election. Mr. Disraeli became Prime Minister. In 1878 he established the Board of Intermediate Education (which is still on its trial), and in 1879 the Royal University, which has recently been abolished.

The General Election of 1880 placed Mr. Gladstone in power. In 1881 he carried a Land Act, which may fairly be described as the tenants charter—the first really successful Land Act placed on the Statute Book. In 1882 he passed the Arrears Act, and in 1884 the Reform Act, which at length gave Ireland the chance of sending an effective representation to the English House of Commons. In June, 1885, the Gladstone Ministry resigned, and Lord Salisbury became Prime Minister. The Land Act of 1881 made all the Land Acts which have since been passed not only possible, but inevitable. The Act of 1881 had taken away the arbitrary power of the landlords—their occupation, as landlords, was gone—and they were now as anxious to sell their estates as the tenants were to buy. The real question of settlement was one of price. Accordingly we find that, in 1885, Lord Salisbury passed an important Land Purchase Act.

The General Election of November, 1885, made the Irish, for the fourth time since the Union, 'masters of the situation.' In January, 1886, they drove Lord Salisbury from office, and made Mr. Gladstone Prime Minister. In April he introduced the first Home Rule Bill, which was defeated in the Commons on the second reading. In June Parliament was dissolved.

The General Election of July, 1886, was a triumph for the Tories, and Lord Salisbury again became Prime Minister. There were more surprises. Parnell had demanded a revision of the judicial rents fixed under the Land Act of 1881. Lord Salisbury said, in 1886 :—

We do not contemplate any revision of judicial rent. We do not think it would be honest, in the first place, and we think it would be exceedingly inexpedient.

Nevertheless, in 1887, Lord Salisbury passed a Land Act authorizing the revision of the judicial rents fixed during the years 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, and 1885. Parnell had also demanded the admission of lease-holders to the benefit of the Act of 1881. Mr. Gladstone refused to admit them. Lord Salisbury admitted them in 1887. Assuredly wonders never cease in politics. But Lord Salisbury's measures of Land Reform did not cease with the Act of 1887. He passed two Land Purchase Acts, one in 1888 and one in 1891.

There was another General Election in 1892. The Irish once more held the balance between English parties. In 1893 Mr. Gladstone introduced the second Home Rule Bill. It passed the Commons, but was rejected by the Lords, and lost; nevertheless, the Liberal Government was held in office by the Irish vote from 1892 to 1895.

(Mr. Gladstone was Prime Minister from 1892 to 1894, and Lord Rosebery from 1894 to 1895.)

The Government did nothing for Ireland; and it must be admitted that, under these circumstances, the Irish Parliamentary Party committed a huge blunder in keeping them in office. We now know that Mr. Gladstone wished to take the constitutional course of appealing to the country immediately on the rejection of the Home Rule Bill by the House of Lords; but his Cabinet would not let him do so. Had the Irish insisted, as they ought to have insisted, on a dissolution, their attitude would have been grateful to the English Prime Minister. By their inactivity they lent support to a reactionary Cabinet, and thwarted the honest counsels of a Prime Minister who meant business.

In 1895 there was another General Election, and the Tories came back with an overwhelming majority. In 1896 another Land Purchase Act was carried, and in 1898 the Irish Local Government Act—one of the most sweeping measures of Irish reform—was passed.

The next General Election was in 1900. The Tories again won at the polls, and Mr. Balfour became Prime Minister. In 1903 another Land Purchase Act was passed. The Tories were outbidding the Liberals on the question of Land Reform in Ireland.

The General Election of 1906 placed the Liberals in power. Home Rule was abandoned for the nonce, and a Council's Bill—which the Irish people promptly knocked on the head—put in its place. In 1908 the House of Commons passed a resolution declaring

that in the opinion of this House the solution of this problem can only be obtained by giving to the Irish people the legislative and executive control of all purely Irish affairs, subject to the supreme authority of the Imperial Parliament.

In the same year a measure for the establishment of the National University became law. In 1909 another important Land Act was passed. In the same year the House of Lords threw out the Budget, Parliament was dissolved, and in January, 1910, a General Election took place. The Prime Minister ran up the Home Rule flag and got the Irish vote.

The General Election of 1910 made the Irish 'masters of the situation,' thus :—

Liberals	275
Unionists	273
					<hr/>
Liberal Majority		2
					<hr/>
Nationalists		82
Labour	40

What happened? Home Rule was not touched. The Government attacked the House of Lords. The famous Veto resolutions were passed in the House of Commons in April, 1910, providing, *inter alia*, that

it is expedient that the powers of the House of Lords be restricted by law, so that any such Bill which has passed the House of Commons in three successive Sessions and, having been sent up to the House of Lords at least one month before the end of the Session, has been rejected by that House in each of those Sessions, shall become law without the consent of the House of Lords on the Royal assent being declared: Provided that at least two years shall have elapsed between the date of the first introduction of the Bill in the House of Commons and the date on which it passes the House of Commons for the third time.

In May, King Edward VII. died. Immediately afterwards a Conference, consisting of four members of the Government and four members of the Opposition, met to consider the 'Constitutional Question.' The Conference was a failure. It settled nothing; and the Lords would not accept what came to be called the Veto resolutions. On November 28 Parliament was dissolved. *The General Election took place in December*, and the Irish came back once more 'masters of the situation,' thus:—

Liberals	272
Unionists	272
Nationalists	84
Labour	42

The Irish have now held the balance between English parties seven times since the General Election of 1826; and it is worth noting that not on one occasion, up to the present, has any Irish party been enabled, by this position of vantage, to place on the Statute Book the particular measure which the Irish people, at the moment, wanted.

What, then, does the story of 'Ireland in the General Elections' teach us? This: that confidence can be placed in no English party; that Irishmen should be neither elated nor depressed at the declaration of any English Minister, whether he seems, at the moment, to be for or against Ireland; that the essential principle is to play off one English party against the other; and that, above all, the motto of every Irish Parliamentary Party should be *Sinn féin amháin!*

R. BARRY O'BRIEN.

Notes and Queries

CANON LAW

ORDINATION 'EXTRA TEMPORA.'—ORDINATION OF NON-SUBJECTS.—POWERS OF THE FORMULA SEXTA

REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly let me know (1) if, in virtue of powers conferred by the Formula Sexta, Irish Bishops can grant their subjects permission to be ordained in other dioceses 'extra tempora' and 'non servatis interstitiis'; also (2) if they can utilize these special powers in regard to other Bishops' subjects?

SACERDOS.

1°. As far as the Formula Sexta itself is concerned, the Bishops cannot grant such permission. Though they have the 'facultas conferendi ordines extra tempora et non servatis interstitiis, usque ad sacerdotium inclusive' (art. 26), they are prohibited from using it outside the boundaries of the diocese: 'nec illis uti possit (episcopus) extra fines suae diocesis' (art. 29). This latter clause deprives them of the power in the case mentioned. Cf., for instance, S. Many:—

Unde etiam si proprius subditus sit in dioecesi aliena, v.g., in aliquo seminario, potest proprius episcopus, fruens indulto *extra tempora*, concedere subdito suo ut recipiat ordines ab episcopo hujus alienae dioecesis, qui, vi indulti, conferat ordines extra tempora. Ratio est quia concessio dispensationis vel delegatio ad concedendam dispensationem, est actus voluntariae jurisdictionis quem episcopus potest exercere extra dioecesim. Excipitur: *Nisi in indulto specialiter cautum sit ut episcopus uti nequeat indulto extra fines dioecesis*. Sic episcopi Americae septent., qui, vi facultatum Formulae I., art. 1, possunt conferre ordines extra tempora, non possunt uti hac facultate extra fines dioecesis, ut expresse cavetur *ibid.*, in art. 29.¹

In regard to the 'interstices,' however, a special con-

¹ *De Sacra Ordinatione*, p. 260.

cession, first granted in 1888 for five years, and renewed in 1894, 1898, 1904, and 1909, enables them to give the permission to their subjects in Maynooth College and in the Irish College, Paris. The rescript may be seen in the Appendix to the Maynooth Statutes (1900, p. 155). It does not deal with the case of an 'extra tempora' ordination, but partial provision had been already made for that contingency by two rescripts,¹ granting to Maynooth College the privilege of conferring Minor Orders, subdeaconship and deaconship, once a year on a day of double rite.

2°. The common opinion, based on a reply of the Congregation of the Inquisition to the Bishop of Vienna, used to be that even when all other canonical requirements, in regard to dimissorial letters, for instance, had been complied with, Bishops could not use these powers in regard to non-subjects. Cf. again, Many²:—

Episcopus qui fruitur indulto conferendi ordines extra tempora, hoc uti nequit erga subditos alienos, etiam habentes priorum Ordinariorum dimissorias. Ratio est quia hoc indultum concedi solet episcopis pro necessitate aut utilitate propriae dioecesis; unde mens concedentis est ut non valeat nisi pro dioecesanis, et ideo S. Congr. Inquisitionis, ab episcopo Viennensi interrogata: 'Quomodo intelligi debeat paragraphus 13 in facultatibus suis formulae III. contentus, sonans *ordinandi extra tempora*; utrum ordinare possit quoscunque etiam alterius dioecesis absque expresso indulto apostolico'; respondit, 'Negative,' 31 Maii 1708.³

This opinion must now be changed in harmony with a decision given by the Congregation of the Sacraments, and approved and confirmed by the Sovereign Pontiff:

In Congregatione generali, die 13 Augusti 1909 habita, proposito dubio 'utrum episcopus, gaudens indulto conferendi ordines extra tempora et non servatis interstitiis, eo uti possit etiam erga alienos subditos, suorum Ordinariorum dimissorias habentes,' Emi. Patres, re mature perpensa, respondendum censuerunt: '*affirmative*, facto verbo cum SSmo.' Sanctitas vero

¹ Dated respectively, May 26, 1883, and May 17, 1885. They may be seen in any copy of the College *Calendar*.

² *Ibid.*

³ Cf. Gasparri, *De Sacr. Ordin.*, i. §80, etc.

Sua, audita relatione R. P. D. ejusdem sacrae Congregationis Secretarii in audientia 15 Augusti 1909, Emorum. Patrum resolutionem approbavit et confirmavit.¹

If the Ordinand, therefore, has dimissorial letters from his own Ordinary, an Irish Bishop may ordain him outside the appointed times and without observing the canonical 'interstices.'

**LAW REGARDING THE ORDINARY CONFESSOR FOR NUNS—
STRICT ORDERS AND OTHERS**

REV. DEAR SIR,—Is there any general law of the Church prohibiting a Bishop from appointing more than one ordinary confessor for the nuns in his diocese? The practice of appointing only one is, I am convinced from a pretty extensive experience, attended occasionally with serious inconvenience. In some institutions, and I have one before my mind at the present moment, the number of nuns is very great, and there are naturally many among them who would like a choice of confessors now and then. I have known cases, too, in which the same confessor has been continued in office for several years, and that, of course, increases the difficulty. I have been asked whether, within the limits of Canon Law, any remedy can be found for the evils attendant on the present system, and I should like to have your opinion before replying.

P.P.

We take it that our correspondent, when he speaks of the appointment of 'one ordinary confessor for nuns in a diocese,' means the appointment of an ordinary confessor for each separate house. If only one priest were appointed for all the institutions, the discharge of his duties as confessor would leave him very little time for other work. The ordinary practice is, of course, to appoint one for each house; so that, when there are several houses, there are also several 'ordinary confessors for nuns in the diocese.' And the practice is in harmony with the law, for, according to the authorities, approbation for one institution does not imply approbation for all²: though there is nothing to prevent

¹ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, vol. i. p. 656. See the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, tome 42, n. 1, p. 41.

² Gregory XV., *Inscrutabili*; Clement X., *Superna*; Benedict XIV., *Pastoralis Curæ*; etc.

a Bishop, if he chooses, from granting confessors faculties for all the institutions over which he has control.¹ All this, we are sure, our correspondent understands, though his statement of the case is ambiguous.

In enumerating the inconveniences which, as he alleges, are attendant on the present system, 'P.P.' must surely have forgotten the modifications of the common law made by the Council of Trent, and subsequently by the Roman Congregations and the Popes, especially by Leo XIII. According to the law of Trent,² as explained by Benedict XIV.,³ the Bishop must appoint a confessor extraordinary who is to appear and, if requested, to hear the nuns' confessions two or three times a year; and though the Council speaks of 'two or three times,' canonists admit that there is nothing in the law to prevent the Bishop from authorizing him to appear oftener if the circumstances of the case seem to warrant it.⁴ If a nun, whether belonging to a strict Order or not, is compelled to live for a time outside her convent, she is free to make her confession to any approved confessor of the place she happens to reside.⁵ Moreover, even when she remains in her convent, she is allowed, whenever she feels that her spiritual good demands it, to ask for and obtain the services of any confessor she may select.⁶ The Bishop is expected to appoint priests in the locality where the institution is situated, and give them the requisite faculties in case they are called upon to act.⁷ The superiors are to throw no difficulty in the way, nor to enquire into the

¹ Lehmkuhl, *Theol. Mor.*, ii., 515, etc.

² Sess. 25, c. 10, *De Regul.*, vide below.

³ Const. *Pastoralis Curae*, s. 3.

⁴ Cf. Lehmkuhl, *Theol. Mor.*, ii. 518. The Maynooth Decrees state 'ter aut quater in anno' (n. 380).

⁵ Decisions given August 27, 1852, and April 22, 1872; cf. *Normae*, n. 149: 'Quoties sorores in aliqua publica ecclesia suam confessionem peragant, apud quemcumque sacerdotem ab episcopo approbatum confiteri possunt.'

⁶ Leo XIII., Const. *Quemadmodum*, December 17, 1890, n. 11: 'Sanctitas Sua Praesules Superioresque admonet ne extraordinarium denegent subditis confessarium quotiens ut propriae conscientiae consulant ad id subditi adigantur, quin iidem Superiores ullo modo petitionis rationem inquirant, aut aegre id ferre demonstrent.' S. Cong. Ep. et Reg., August 17, 1891: 'III. . . . idem Religiosus eligere poterit, inter diversos ab Ordinario deputatos, qui hoc sibi munus impleat?' 'Ad III. . . . *Affirmative.*'

⁷ *Ibid.*, n. 12: 'idoneos sacerdotes facultatibus instructos designent.'

reasons that prompt the appeal to the extern confessor: even when they see that there is no real necessity in the case and that, though the nun thinks otherwise, the request is really due to scruples or other mental defect, they are to comply with her wishes.¹ If there are extrinsic reasons that seem to them to render a certain confessor undesirable, if, for instance, he is unfriendly to the Order or likely to interfere with the normal administration of discipline, they are not to take the matter into their own hands, but to submit the case to the Ordinary.² Confessors, it is true, are bound not to come when they know for certain that the reasons underlying the request are entirely frivolous³; and the interference of extern confessors is to be regarded as the exception, not the rule.⁴ But we think that, 'within the limits of Canon Law,' as exemplified in the regulations mentioned, ample provision is made not merely 'for a choice of confessors now and then,' but for the fullest exercise of liberty whenever there is anything even fairly serious at stake. And in view of these regulations we fail to see that 'P.P.' or the institutions for which he speaks have really any great grievance after all. For a considerable number of the ordinary faithful there is often only one confessor to whom they are free to go in normal circumstances—on the occasion of missions and retreats the freedom of choice is greater. In exceptional cases they may, with some inconvenience to themselves, have recourse to strange confessors. The nuns are almost in the same position.

As for a general law prohibiting the appointment of more than one ordinary confessor for each house, there can be no doubt that such a law exists in the case of nuns

¹ S. Congr. Ep. et Reg., August 17, 1891: 'quamvis plane videant necessitatem esse fictam, et vel scrupulis vel alio mentis defectu, ut veram ab ipso petente apprehensam.'

² S. Congr. Ep. et Reg., August 5, 1904: 'Si adsint rationes vere graves, Superiorissa eas subiiciat Ordinario, cuius iudicio standum erit.'

³ S. Congr. Ep. et Reg., February 1, 1892: '2^o. I confessori aggiunti hanno alcun dovere di coscienza di refutarsi ad ascoltare le confessioni delle suore, quando riconoscono che non esiste un plausibile motivo che le astringa di ricorrere ad essi?' Ad II. 'Affirmative.' Vermeersch, *De Relig.*, ii. p. 637.

⁴ *Vide* below.

who have solemn vows and observe the papal enclosure. It is not, however, to be regarded as a special law made for nuns alone, but rather as the last relic of a regulation that was once universal. Up to the fifteenth century it affected lay people as well as religious : for everyone had his *proprius sacerdos*, to whom he was obliged to confess.¹ Then, through the natural evolution of Church discipline, and especially as a result of the favours granted to the Mendicant Orders, the laity were freed from the restriction. Lastly, came modifications affecting religious Orders of men. Clement VIII.,² Urban VIII.,³ and Pius IX.⁴ issued Decrees on the subject, with the result that, at the present day, several confessors, in addition to the superiors themselves, are appointed for each house, and the power of the superiors, in regard to reserving cases, is severely curtailed. It is only as regards the strict religious Orders of women that the old law remains in force. It is alluded to in the regulations of Trent : '*praeter ordinarium autem confessarium alius extraordinarius ab episcopo et aliis superioribus bis aut ter in anno offeratur.*' It is expressly stated in the Constitution *Pastoralis Curae* of Benedict XIV. :—

Non quidem intendimus consultissimam illam et veteris disciplinae auctoritate roboratam Legem tollere aut abrogare qua generaliter statutum esse dignoscitur, ut pro singulis Monialium Monasteriis unus dumtaxat confessarius deputetur, qui sacramentales confessiones universae earum communitatis excipiat, neque liceat unicuique Moniali peculiarem confessarium pro libito sibi deligere.

And the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, in their reply to questions put to them on February 1, 1892, refer to it as the common law enforced by the Council of Trent and by Benedict XIV. :—

Moneat Ordinarius moniales et sorores, de quibus agitur, Dispositionem articuli iv. Decreti *Quemadmodum* exceptionem

¹ *Summa Raymundi*, 1. 3.

² *Sanctissimus Dominus*, May 26, 1593.

³ The extension of the previous Decree given in the *Bullarium Rom.*, t. 5, p. 5, is probably his.

⁴ August 16, 17, 1866.

tantum legi communi constituere, pro casibus dumtaxat verae et absolutae necessitatis, quoties ad id adigantur, firmo remanente quod a S. Concilio Tridentino et a Constitutione Benedicti XIV. incipiente *Pastoralis Curae* praeceptum habetur.

In the *Periodica* (December 1, 1909), we find some interesting observations on the subject by Father Vermeersch. After sketching the origin and history of the law, he comes to discuss the reasons underlying it. The first, put forward by St. Raymond, applied to the laity as well as to the religious, and were found in the obligation a pastor was under of having an intimate knowledge of the flock committed to his charge. According to the less rigorous ideas then prevailing regarding the seal, a confessor, though bound not to do anything that would reveal a penitent's confession, was free to make secret use of the information gained. The teaching has been long discredited; external government is now completely divorced from the sacramental forum; and the primary motive that gave rise to the law has, therefore, ceased to exist. In the case of nuns, however, there are supplementary reasons why the discipline should continue: one is found in the requirements of the enclosure; the other in the necessity for maintaining a uniform system of direction and government. Father Vermeersch doubts whether these altogether outweigh the inconvenience caused by a strict adherence to the letter of the law. He thinks the legislation on the point should be interpreted strictly, and concludes that the custom of having two approved confessors is not unreasonable, especially where the community is a large one, or when the regulations of the Holy See regarding a change of confessors every three years are not scrupulously carried out.

It is possible that our correspondent had all this in view when he wrote the letter quoted. The opinion of the distinguished Jesuit is worthy of all respect, and goes far to justify a custom of the kind already established. But, in view of the fact that even Leo XIII., the great patron of the milder practice, had no intention of interfering with the old law, we hardly think that a superior would be within his right in introducing a custom merely on the strength of the opinion.

As regards nuns with simple vows, there is no general law. The tendency of ecclesiastical legislation, it is true, is to assimilate, as far as convenient, their treatment to that already prescribed for nuns with solemn vows. Bishops, therefore, generally appoint only one ordinary confessor.¹ But they are under no obligation in the matter. And since, unless they determine otherwise, the ordinary approbation they give their priests will enable the latter to hear the confession of the nuns in question,² they may, without even going to the trouble of granting special faculties, appoint as many ordinary confessors as they please.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

LITURGY

INSCRIPTION OF NAMES IN SCAPULAR CONFRATERNITIES

REV. DEAR SIR,—In order that Scapular enrolments would be valid, is it necessary that all names should be sent to houses of Orders having proper authority to have the names inserted in their registers? In the case of the united Scapulars, must the names be sent to the different places corresponding with each Scapular? If so, what are the addresses?

SACERDOS.

Several questions have been asked and answered in past issues of the I. E. RECORD with regard to the formalities of enrolment in the various Scapular sodalities. As the matter is of practical importance it may be touched upon once more without any apologies for its frequent repetition. Assuming now that a Confraternity, strictly so called, is canonically erected, and a director appointed and invested with full faculties for the enrolment of members, what are the conditions to be observed in the reception of members?

1°. In the nature of things there must be a proper intention on the part of those who wish to join the Sodality and of those who perform the act of reception.

2°. There must, as a rule, be some form of words employed by the priest who receives. This is presupposed

¹ cf. Maynooth Statutes, n. 379.

² Lehmkuhl, l.c.; Smith, *Elements of Ecc. Law*, i. p. 481, etc.

in all the Decrees of the Congregation of Indulgences that refer to receptions into the Scapular Confraternities. The formula connotes the blessing of the Scapulars, their imposition, and the creation of membership, so that if it is not substantially observed the reception will be invalid.

3°. In those Scapular Confraternities that are such in the true sense it has been declared authoritatively that the names of the members must be inscribed on a register kept in some place where there exists a canonically-erected branch of the particular Confraternity. Now, of the Scapular Sodalities those of the Blessed Trinity, the Seven Dolours of the Blessed Virgin, and Our Lady of Mount Carmel are real Confraternities, so that for membership in these the inscription of the names is essential in order to gain the indulgences. For a time, indeed, the last-named Confraternity enjoyed exemption from this essential requirement, but, as stated in reply to another query in the present issue, this privilege was withdrawn in the year 1887, so that things are now as they ought to be in accordance with general principles. It is probably to this temporary immunity, which the Confraternity of Mount Carmel has enjoyed, that is due all the confusion that exists in the minds of many people about the necessity of complying with a condition that is vital to valid receptions in all true Confraternities of the Scapular. It need scarcely be noted that the mere material inscription of the names can be done by any person duly authorized by the priest who is competent to perform the enrolment. Further, the Congregation of Indulgences was accustomed to issue from time to time *decreta sanctionis* which made good any invalidities in the receptions to the Confraternity of the Brown Scapular. The wearing of the Red Scapular of the Passion is a mere devotional practice, and it is not necessary to be a member of any Sodality to gain the indulgences. The same is true of the Scapulars of the Sacred Heart, the Precious Blood, the Hearts of Jesus and Mary, Our Lady of Good Counsel, St. Joseph, etc. The Blue Scapular of the Immaculate Conception was not originally associated with any Sodality. But in the year 1894 a Confraternity of the Immaculate

Conception of the Blessed Virgin was established in the Church of the Theatines in Rome, and subsequently raised to the rank of an Archconfraternity with power to affiliate branches. Priests, therefore, who receive faculties for blessing Scapulars of the Immaculate Conception from the General of the Theatines are required to register the names in affiliated branches of the Society. But no such precaution is necessary in regard to the use of faculties obtained before 1894.¹

When the names are to be entered and when there is no regularly established branch of the Confraternity in a given locality, they should be sent to some place where there is a canonically erected branch, or to the nearest house of the religious Order with which the Scapular is associated. If preferred the names may, of course, be sent to the office of the Archconfraternity in Rome. The address of the General of the Carmelites is *Santa Maria Traspontina*; that of the General of the Servites of Mary (Seven Dolours), *Santa Maria in Via*; and that of the General of the Order of the Most Blessed Trinity, *Santo Crisogono* (Trastevere).

RECOGNITION OF FACULTIES FOR INDULGENCING PIOUS OBJECTS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Have faculties for blessing, with usual indulgences, Dolour Beads, Red and Blue Scapulars, etc., obtained through the Superior-Generals of religious Orders before April 7, 1910, and not since submitted to the Congregation of the Holy Office, lapsed? If so, may they still be submitted and regained?

Was there an Indult of Pope Gregory XVI., May 30, 1838, modifying one of Paul V., regarding the inscription of the names of those invested in the Scapular of Our Lady of Mount Carmel in the register of the Confraternity?

A reply in the I. E. RECORD will oblige

A SUBSCRIBER.

The regulations recently made about the necessity of having all faculties for attaching indulgences to medals and pious objects duly authenticated by the Holy Office

¹ Cf. Beringer, *Les Indulgences*, i. p. 563.

were explained at some length in the October issue of the I. E. RECORD for the year 1910. When the reform of the Roman Curia was effected by the Constitution *Sapienti Consilio* in 1908, the department of Indulgences was entrusted to the Congregation of the Holy Office. Shortly afterwards rules were enacted requiring that faculties for granting indulgences not obtained directly from this source should at least be authenticated by the Congregation. There were some exceptions. The new regulations did not affect the Propaganda. For countries, therefore, within its jurisdiction it continues to act as before. Neither did the new rules apply to those faculties obtained from the heads of religious Orders in regard to these indulgences and the powers for granting them, that have been by Apostolic favour the peculiar heritage of these Orders. If, then, a priest has obtained faculties to bless Scapulars, Rosaries, and other pious objects from the religious Orders, respectively, which have the privilege of granting the faculties, there is no necessity of having the faculties obtained in this way authenticated.¹ The reason of the exemption in these cases is presumably because the public have a guarantee that the powers procured from these sources will be orthodox and genuine.

It is quite true that Gregory XVI., by a special Indult dated April 30, 1838, exempted the members of the Confraternity of the Brown Scapular from the obligation of having their names inserted on a register of some canonically erected branch of the Confraternity. But in the year 1887, at the instance of the Procurator-General of the Discalced Carmelites, Leo XIII. withdrew the Gregorian Indult on April 27. At the present time, therefore, the registering of the names is essential for valid membership in the Confraternity of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, just as it is in the case of all true Confraternities.

¹ Cf. I. E. RECORD, February, 1911, p. 213.

EXPOSITION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT ON HOLY THURSDAY

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly give your opinion regarding the lawfulness of a practice of long standing which exists in some convents of nuns in this diocese, and seems to be contrary to the Rubrics. On Holy Thursday, immediately after Low Mass, Solemn Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament is given in the Convent Chapel; and, then, as part of the function the celebrant, vested in cope and veil, carries the Blessed Sacrament solemnly to a Side-Altar of Repose most devotionally ornamented with lights and flowers, where 'Adoration' is kept on till evening, as in churches where the three days' ceremonies are carried out. If you kindly reply in the March or April number of the I. E. RECORD, you will much oblige

A CHAPLAIN.

The circumstances of the case seem to be these: a private or Low Mass is said in the Convent Chapel (presumably in virtue of an Indult) on Holy Thursday morning apart from any connexion with the functions of the Triduum. Immediately after Mass Solemn Benediction is given. Then the Blessed Sacrament is taken to an Altar of Repose, and Adoration is carried on there with the usual ceremonies until evening, when the Host is again restored to the tabernacle. There are certainly some things here at variance with the Rubrics. In the first place, the Benediction appears to be quite irregular. Not only is there no sanction for it, but it seems out of joint with the spirit of the Liturgy on this particular day. The keynote of the Triduum is sorrow, and with this sentiment Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament cannot be in harmony, since it is a function closely associated with joy and thanksgiving. In all Processions of the Blessed Sacrament that take place during the year there is always at least one blessing given with the Sacred Host, but in the Procession of Holy Thursday morning there is no provision made for any Benediction. Again, the Exposition is not lawful, whether it is carried out at the High Altar or at the Altar of Repose. A Decree dated November 30, 1889, reprobates the custom by which, after Low Mass in Convent Chapels, the Blessed Sacrament was

exposed for Adoration on the Altar until evening. Another Decree prohibits the carrying of the Consecrated Species in same circumstances to an Altar of Repose. There is, however, nothing against reserving the Blessed Sacrament in the tabernacle for the adoration of the faithful on Holy Thursday in those churches where the ceremonies of the Triduum are not performed, provided that no floral decorations are used or any attempt made to have anything in the form of a Solemn Exposition.¹

COMMUNION ON HOLY SATURDAY

REV. DEAR SIR,—Would you kindly give an answer to the following difficulty:—

1°. It is decreed that the faithful may receive Communion on Holy Saturday, and fulfil thereby their Paschal duty. Is there anything disapproving Communion of devotion on Holy Saturday?

2°. In certain towns in the North of England many of the faithful find Good Friday a convenient day for Confession and Holy Saturday for their Easter Communion. Now, it is also found that the long solemn services of Holy Saturday make it rather trying for some to wait for the Communion given at the High Mass. In these circumstances Communion has been given in a certain church while the sacred ministers were engaged at the blessing of the Font. Is there anything to condemn this practice? Some of the Rubrics about the preservation on Holy Thursday of only a few consecrated particles for the Communion of the sick in danger of death seem to be obsolete in those days of frequent Communion when the communicants are not counted, and it would be inconvenient to consume a large number of sacred particles left over, and when the tendency is to give every possible facility for the reception of Holy Communion.—
Faithfully yours,

BISCOP.

Speaking generally, it may be safely said that neither in the letter nor in the spirit of the Liturgy is there any prohibition against the distribution of Communion on Holy Saturday. Some writers, indeed, seem to be under the

¹ Cf. I. E. RECORD, June, 1908, p. 654.

impression that the inhibition of Good Friday extended to the following day, but there is no proof that this is so. On the contrary, it may be gathered from the old Roman Ordinals that in former times the faithful were wont to receive Communion on this morning¹; while even the modern Missal assumes that others besides the celebrant are communicated at the Mass—*Sacramentis paschalibus satiatos esse*. Again, there was an idea among certain authorities that Communion, though quite lawful, could not, however, be received until after Mass on Holy Saturday,² unless where it was customary. This opinion must now be abandoned in deference to a Decree of the Congregation of Rites, which says that Communion may be given *intra Missarum Solemnia*, and adds that the faithful may satisfy thereby the Paschal obligation.³ So far, then, it is clear that the distribution of Communion on Holy Saturday, either during Mass or afterwards, is not in any way against the Rubrics. It only remains now to see whether it may be given in the circumstances described. There are reasons which dictate that the usual time for its distribution may not be anticipated without reasonable cause, but whether there is any special reason peculiar to Holy Saturday which would render it undesirable to give it before Mass does not appear. Van Der Stappen says it is not lawful, but he does not mention any authority.⁴ Neither can any formal prohibition of this kind be discovered among the Decrees of the Congregation of Rites. If the Mass were an isolated function and unconnected with the other ceremonies, there would probably be very little doubt about the matter; but it would seem that the interruption of the functions of Holy Saturday morning in the manner suggested (or rather the carrying out in the same church and at the same moment of two ceremonies, namely, the blessing of the Font and the distribution of Communion) is, to say the least, not becoming if not un-rubrical. Moreover, as the persons who communicate may

¹ Cf. *Ordo Rom.*, i., n. 16, apud Mabillon, *Museum It.*, ii. p. 28.

² Cf. Lehmkuhl, *Theol. Mor.*, ii. p. 169, ed. nov.

³ n. 2561.

⁴ iv., § 189.

be reasonably expected to remain for Mass nothing is gained apparently by anticipating the distribution of Communion except the saving of a little time, and this would scarcely compensate for the other inconvenience just mentioned.

The Church wishes, no doubt, in these days that the faithful should have every facility for receiving Holy Communion as often as possible; but, then, she desires, too, that everything should be done *secundum Ordinem* and in due circumstances.

VESTMENTS TO BE WORN BY PREACHER

REV. DEAR SIR,—May I trouble you to answer in the I. E. RECORD, as soon as possible, the following question:—

Is it against the Rubrics for a priest who celebrates public Mass on Sunday, and who must during that Mass leave the Altar or Sanctuary to preach from the pulpit, to wear, while preaching, the maniple or chasuble?

SIMPLEX.

If the celebrant has to leave the Altar in order to preach from the pulpit he should put off the chasuble and maniple before doing so. These vestments may be left on the Altar or a bench in the Sanctuary. The biretta is worn on the way to the pulpit, and also during the sermon. When the discourse is delivered by the celebrant from the Altar, then, at a High Mass, he sits with head covered and fully vested on a seat placed at the Gospel side and, at a Low Mass, he stands without the biretta in the same place, during the delivery of the sermon. In the latter case he may either retain, or lay aside, the chasuble and maniple according to convenience.¹

P. MORRISROE.

¹ Meratus, p. ii. tit. 6, n. 38.

DOCUMENTS

MASS IN PORTIUNCULA

PECULIARES CONCESSIONES PRO MISSIS VOTIVIS IN PATRIARCHALI
BASILICA S. MARIAE ANGELORUM IN PORTIUNCULA CELEBRANDIS

PIUS PP. X.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Perinsignis Patriarchalis Basilica Sanctae Mariae Angelorum in Portiuncula, Ordinis Minorum Caput et Mater, etiam secundi Ordinis Minoritici parens fuit atque altrix. Potiores enim inter laudes, quibus Sanctuarium ipsum, in toto Christiano orbe commendatum, iure ac merito nobilitatur, illa maxime accensenda est, quod locus idem a pia virgine Assisiensi Clara electus fuerit, in quo se totam Deo consecraret, rudem Seraphicae religionis tunicam ab ipso legifero Patre Francisco obtinens. Referunt Ordinis Franciscalis fastorum scriptores, nocte, quae diem decimam nonam Martii mensis anni MCCXII praecessit, Claram Virginem, fluxa omnia et labilia mundi contemnentem, crino tonso coram altari Dominae nupsisse aeterno sponso. Nobilem siquidem puellam, domo, civitate et consanguineis derelictis, ad Sanctae Mariae in Portiuncula acdem festinasse referunt; eandem a fratribus, qui ante Sacram aram Deo excubias observabant, accensis lucernis fuisse receptam, et mox, recisis crinibus, proiectisque divitibus ornamentis, quibus erat induta, in manibus Sancti Francisci repudii libellum mundo tradidisse. Sic eodem in Sanctuario, quo Franciscus prima Ordinis sui fundamenta posuerat, Virginum quoque Franciscalium institutum ortum esse scriptores testantur, ita quidem ut liquido appareat, utramque religiosam familiam ex unico fonte, nempe a Deiparae Virginis gremio, promanasse. Nec supervacaneum quidem hic Nobis videtur piam mirandi illius facti traditionem memorare, quod iidem rerum Franciscalium scriptores evenisse referunt per hyemem annorum MCCXIX-MCCXX. Legimus in eorum narrationibus, Franciscum Patrem, votis annuentem Sanctae Virginis Clarae, illam ad S. Mariae ab Angelis ad mensam invitasse, eandemque locum ubi tonsa fuerat, atque ubi se primum Divino Sponso mancipaverat, coelesti laetitia perfusam, longos post annos revisisse. Exhibito prius Angelorum Reginae humili obsequio,

Franciscum paupere in mensa humi parata, ut mos illi erat, cum Clara et sociis decubuisse, primoque ferculo Franciscum Patrem tam suaviter, tam alte, ac tam sancte de Deo loqui coepisse, ut ipse, Clara, ceterique adstantes in extasim rapti fuerint. Ipsis autem ad Deum raptis, oculisque ac manibus ad Coelum elatis, Assisii et Betonii vicinorumque oppidorum civibus, visa esse omnia comburi, et coenobium ipsamque Sacram aedem sylvasque continentis immani incendio flagrare. Accurrentibus vero confestim auxilio, ne incendii quidem vestigium apparuisse, sed coenobium subeuntes Franciscum, Claram sociosque invenisse circa mensam humillimam ad Dominum raptos ac virtute indutos ex Alto. Tum comperisse incendii speciem a divini amoris flamma manasse, novo in Coenaculo Paraclyti Spiritus ignes arsisse. Oh vere sanctorum omnium sanctissimus appellari locus potest, dignusque propterea cui honores tribuantur amplissimi! Tanta sanctitatis fama, memoriisque tam gloriosis adducti, Romani Pontifices Nostri Decessores Ecclesiam Sanctae Mariae Angelorum in Portiuncula, singularibus gratiis ac privilegiis ornarunt; Nosque eorundem vestigiis insistentes, per similes Apostolicas Litteras, die XI Aprilis mensis anno MDCCCXC piscatoris annulo obsignatas, super enunciatis privilegiis ac iuribus rite recognitis et auctis, Ecclesiam ipsam in Portiuncula, caput et Matrem Ordinis Minorum, Basilicam Patriarchalem et Cappellam Papalem declaravimus. Nunc autem cum dilectus filius Iosephus Bucefari, Minister Fratrum Minorum ad regularem provinciam de Portiuncula pertinentium, votis Sacerdotum ad Sanctuaria Assisiensia peregrinantium, non minus quam Religiosorum suorum obsecundans, Nos enixis precibus adierit, ut privilegium impertiamur, ex quo Sacerdotibus in Portiunculae sacello Sacrum facturis, ex Apostolica Auctoritate liceat Missam votivam de Sancta Clara Assisiensi celebrare, iisdem diebus atque iisdem iuribus, quibus memoratae Nostrae Litterae Missam votivam de Sancto Patre Francisco ibidem celebrari permittunt, Nos animo repetentes Sanctae illius Virginis, secundi Ordinis, idest Monialium omnium Franciscalium institutricis, gloriosa vitae acta, ut eadem, illo in templo, quo ad coelestis sponsi nuptias festinans, alterum illum ordinem feliciter inchoavit, peculiari cultu recolatur, optatis his piis annuendum paterna voluntate existimavimus. Quae cum ita sint, Apostolica Nostra Auctoritate, vi praesentium, perpetuum in modum concedimus, ut in Sacello Portiunculae apud Basilicam Patriarchalem Sanctae Mariae Angelorum, iisdem diebus atque iisdem iuribus ac pri-

vilegiis, quibus Nostrae Litterae die XI Aprilis mensis anno MDCCCXCIX, eadem hac forma datae, Missam votivam de Sancto Patre Francisco ibidem permittunt, fas siet cuique Sacerdoti Sacrum futuro, Missam votivam de Sancta Clara Assisiensi rite litare. Ut autem peregrinantium Sacerdotum tum spirituali solatio, tum commoditati latius consulamus, facultatem similiter Apostolica benignitate addimus, ut Sacerdotes peregrinantes, seu peregrinantium duces, utramque Missam nempe de Sancto Francisco Patre, ac de Sancta Clara Virgine, etiam ad altare Maius Arae Pontificiae nuper consecratae cohaerens, celebrare queant. Tandem Patriarchalem eandem Basilicam nova et quidem singulari voluntatis Nostrae significatione cohonestare volentes, de Apostolicae Nostrae potestatis plenitudine concedimus et largimur, ut ipsam ad Aram Maximam a Sacerdotibus peregrinis, vel peregrinantium ducibus, non modo Missae Sanctorum Francisci et Clarae Assisiensium, sed etiam Missa Virginis Deiparae eadem ac illae ratione, more votivo peragi possit; nec non ut si qua ex his tribus Missis cum cantu sit habenda, ipsa, maxime pro peregrinorum commodo, non solum a Sacerdotibus peregrinis, et peregrinantium ducibus, verum etiam ab aliis presbyteris, servatis rite servandis, queat decantari. Decernentes praesentes Litteras firmas, validas atque efficaces semper existere et fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri et obtinere, illisque ad quos spectat, et in posterum spectabit, in omnibus et per omnia plenissime suffragari, sicque in praemissis per quoscumque iudices ordinarios vel delegatos iudicari et definiri debere, atque irritum esse et inane si secus super his a quoquam, quavis auctoritate, scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari. Non obstantibus Constitutionibus et Ordinationibus Apostolicis, etiam speciali et individua mentione ac derogatione dignis, ceterisque omnibus in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque. Volumus autem ut praesentium Litterarum transumptis, seu exemplis etiam impressis, manu alicuius Notarii publici subscriptis et sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae munitis, eadem prorsus fides adhibeatur quae adhiberetur ipsis praesentibus si forent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die IX Februarii MCMXI, Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *a Secretis Status*.

L. ✠ S.

**DECREE RELATING TO RELIGIOUS OBLIGED TO SERVE IN
THE ARMY****S. CONGREGATIO RELIGIOSIS****DECRETUM DE RELIGIOSIS, SERVITIO MILITARI ADSTRACTIS**

Inter reliquas difficultates, quibus premitur Ecclesia Christi nostris temporibus, ea quoque recensenda lex est, qua ad militiam adiguntur etiam iuvenes, qui in religiosis Familiis Deo famulantur.

Nemo sane non videt, quantum detrimenti ex hac infausta lege provenire possit, quum iuvenibus, tum ipsis Sodalitatibus. Dum enim militiae vacant religiosi tyrones, facile vitiis maculari possunt, quibus infecti, vel, neglectis, quae emiserant, votis, ad saecularia remigrabunt, vel quod longe peius est, religiosam repitent domum, cum periculo alios contaminandi.

Ad haec igitur praecavenda mala, Sacra Congregatio, Negotiis Religiosorum Sodalium praeposita, in Plenario Coetu Eñorum Patrum Cardinalium, die 26 mensis Augusti 1910 ad Vaticanum coadunato, sequentia decrevit :

I. In Ordinibus Regularibus, in quibus vota selemnia emittuntur, invenes, quos exemptos esse certo non constet a servitio militari activo, scilicet ab eo servitio, quod ipsi primitus ad militiam vocati ad unum vel plures annos praestare debent, admitti nequeunt ad Sacros Ordines vel ad solemnem professionem, quousque non peregerint servitium militare et, hoc expleto, saltem per annum, iuxta infra dicenda, in votis simplicibus permanserint, servato quoad Laicos decreto *Sacrosancta Dei Ecclesia*, hac eadem die editio.

II. In Institutis votorum simplicium iuvenes, de quibus in articulo praecedenti, ad vota dumtaxat temporaria admitti poterunt usque ad tempus militaris servitii: nec illis, dum militiae operam dant, professionem renovare liceat.—A militari servitio dimissi cum fuerint, professionem iterum, saltem ad annum, emittent, antequam professionis perpetuae vinculo se obstringant.

III. Caveant autem iuvenes militiae servientes, ne sanctae vocationes donum amittant ac ea semper modestia et cautela conversentur, quae decet Religiosos viros. Quamobrem a locis et conventiculis suspectis abhorreant, a theatris, choreis aliisque spectaculis publicis abstineant; malorum commercium, labricas conversationes, res a religione absonas, viros doctrinas suspectas profitentes, lectiones moribus aut fidei a S. Sedis dictatis contrarias ceteraque peccandi pericula evitent; ecclesias,

sacramenta, quantum eis liceat, frequentare non omittant: circulos seu coetus catholicos ad animi recreationem et instructionem adeant.

IV. Ubi cumque eorum statio ponatur, si ibi domus suae Religionis aut Instituti habeatur, eam frequentent et sub Superioris immediata vigilantia sint.—Si vero domus praedicta non adsit, vel eam commode frequentare nequeant, sacerdotem ab Episcopo designatum adeant, eius consiliis et consuetudine utantur, ut quando eandem stationem deserere oporteat, testimonium in scriptis de observantia eorum omnium, quae in articulo praecedenti praescripta sunt, ab eodem accipere valeant.—Quodsi sacerdos ab Episcopo designatus non habeatur, ipsi sibi eligant prudentem sacerdotem, statim indicandum Superioribus suis, qui ab Ordinario de moribus, doctrina et prudentia eiusdem sibi notitias comparabunt. Praeterea, epistolarum commercium instituant ac, quantum fieri potest, sedulo persequantur cum suo respectivo Superiore aliove religioso seu sodali sui Instituti ad id designato, quem certiores faciant de suae vitae ratione et conditione, de singulis mutationibus suae stationis et praesertim illi notificent nomen et domicilium illius sacerdotis, cuius consuetudine et directione utuntur, ut supra praescriptum est.

V. Superiores Generales aut Provinciales etiam locales, iuxta uniuscuiusque Instituti morem, per se vel delegatum sodalem (qui sacerdotali ordine sit insignitus in clericalibus Institutis) de vita, moribus et conversatione alumnorum, perdurante militari servitio, inquirere omnino teneantur, opera praecipue sacerdotis vel sacerdotum, de quibus supra, per secretas epistolas, si opus sit, ut certiores fiant, an ii rectam fidei et morum viam servaverint, cautelas supra praescriptas observaverint et divinae vocationi sed fideles praebuerint, graviter onerata eorum conscientia.

VI. Cum a militari servitio activo definitive dimissi fuerint, recto tramite ad suas quisque religiosas domus remeare teneantur, ibique, si certo constet de eorum bona conversatione, ut in articulo praecedenti dictum est, praemissis aliquot diebus sanctae recollectionis, qui Institutis votorum simplicium addicti sunt, ad renovandam professionem temporariam admittantur; in Ordinibus vero Regularibus, inter iuniores clericos seu professos, aut saltem in domo, ubi perfecta vigeat regularis observantia, sub speciali vigilantia et directione religiosi, pietate et prudentia commendabilis, qui in Institutis clericalibus sacerdos

esse debet, collocentur. In eo statu integrum tempus (quod minus anno esse non poterit iuxta dicta in articulis I. et II.) ad tramitem Apostolicarum Praescriptionum et propriae Religiosae Familiae Constitutionum praemittendum votis solemnibus vel perpetuis, complere debent, ita tamen, ut computetur quidem tempus in votis simplicibus vel temporaneis transactum a prima votorum emissionem usque ad discessum a domo religiosa, servitii militaris causa; non vero quod militiae datum fuit.

VII. Eo tempore, studiis et regulari observantiae dent operam; Superiores autem immediati ac sodales iuniorum directioni praepositi eos diligentissime considerent, eorum mores, vitae fervorem, placita, doctrinas, perseverandi studium perscrutentur, ut de eis ante ultimam professionem maioribus Superioribus rationem sub fide iuramenti reddere valeant.

VIII. Si qui, perdurante militari servitio vel eo finito, antequam ad professionem solemnem aut perpetuam admittantur, dubia perseverantiae signa dederint, vel praescriptis cautelis militiae tempore non obtemperaverint, aut a morum vel fidei puritate deflexerint, a Superiore Generali de consensu suorum Consiliariorum seu Definitorum dimittantur, eorumque vota ipso dimissionis actu soluta habeantur.—Quodsi ipsi iuvenes a votorum vinculo se relaxari desiderent aut sponte petant, facultas fit Superioribus praedictis, tamquam Apostolicae Sedis delegatis, vota solvendi, si agatur de Institutis clericalibus: si vero res sit de Institutis laicorum, vota soluta censeantur per litteras Superiorum, quibus licentia eis fit ad saeculum redeundi.

IX. Hisce praescriptis teneantur etiam ecclesiasticae Societates quae, licet non utantur votis, neque solemnibus neque simplicibus, habent tamen simplices promissiones, quibus earum alumni ipsis Societatibus adstringuntur.

X. Si quid novi in hoc Decreto non praevisum, vel si quid dubii in ipsius intelligentia occurrerit, ad hanc S. Congregationem in singulis casibus recurratur.

Quae omnia Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Papa X., referente Subsecretario, rata habere et confirmare dignatus est, die 27 eiusdem mensis Augusti 1910. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae, ex Secretaria Sacrae Congregationis de Religiosis, die 1 Ianuarii 1911.

L. ✠ S.

FR. J. C. CARD. VIVES, *Praefectus*.

✠ DONATUS, *Archiep. Ephesinus, Secretarius*.

THE VATICAN EDITION OF LITURGICAL BOOKS

S. CONGREGATIO RITUM

DECRETUM SEU DECLARATIO SUPER EDITIONE VATICANA EIUSQUE
REPRODUCTIONE QUOAD LIBROS LITURGICOS GREGORIANOS

Per decretum diei 11 Augusti 1905 Sacra Rituum Congregatio statuit ac declaravit Editionis Vaticanæ libros liturgicos gregorianos respicientis reproductiones adamussim esse conformandas eidem typicæ editioni, nihil prorsus addito, dempto vel mutato. Quod si ex quadam S. Sedis tolerantia et permittente Ordinario, aliquoties præfatis reproductionibus addita fuere quaedam signa, ritmica nuncupata, atque ita ipsæ reproductiones in vulgus editæ ac venditæ, tamen in seligendis atque adhibendis eiusmodi signis pluries conquestum est per ea aliquantum variari ac inmutari notulas traditionales vaticanas: et ad hos abusus removendos idem Sacrum Consilium evulgandum censuit alterum decretum sub die 14 Februarii 1906. Quum tamen non omnes abusus cessaverint et alii recentiores adiecti sint, sive ob titulum adhibitum *Editionis ritmicæ*, sive ob interpretationem haud rectam decretorum, necessaria fuit nova declaratio authentica expressa per epistolam Secretarii S. R. C. datam die 2 Maii 1906. Quæ epistola typographis facultatem et licentiam rite habentibus reproducendi editionem typicam Vaticanam clare significabat hanc solam editionem ab Apostolica Sede esse approbatam atque præscriptam pro usu cantus gregoriani, una cum subsequentibus editionibus eidem plane conformibus; ceterasque editiones ritmicas nuncupatas ob signa adiuncta, habendas tantum toleratas; atque hoc sensu esse intelligendum decretum latum die 14 Februarii 1906.

Quæ quum ita sint, ut removeantur abusus existentes et præcludatur via tum enunciatis tum aliis quæ facile irrepere possent, Sacra eadem Congregatio sequentia decernere atque enucleatius declarare voluit:

I. Editionem Vaticanam de libris liturgicis gregorianis, prouti evulgata fuit Auctoritate Apostolica, cum suis notulis traditionalibus et cum regulis Graduali Romano præfixis, satis superque continere quæ ad rectam cantus liturgici executionem conferunt.

II. Reproducciones eiusdem editionis typicæ, quæ præferunt signa superinducta, ritmica dicta, per abusum vocari editiones ritmicas, atque uti tales haud fuisse approbatas, sed tantum precario toleratas: hanc vero tolerantiam, attentis

rerum adiunctis, amplius non admitti, nisi pro solis editionibus iam factis, Gradualis et Officii Defunctorum, ideoque nullatenus extendi sive ad editiones cum notulis gregorianis sive ad transumpta cum eisdem notulis Antiphonarii et aliorum quorumcumque librorum cantum liturgicum continentium, quae ad normam Motus Proprii diei 25 Aprilis 1904 et Decretorum huius S. R. C., tum pro universali Ecclesia, tum pro singulis Dioecesibus vel Congregationibus, adhuc instauranda sunt et evulganda.

III. Rñis Ordinariis locorum ac Superioribus Ordinum seu Congregationum interim licere editiones precario a S. Sede toleratas permittere intra limites propriae iurisdictionis, quin tamen ipsi eas in locis sibi subiectis praecipere, atque usum editionis adprobatae inhibere valeant.

Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die 25 Ianuarii 1911.

FR. S. CARD. MARTINELLI, *Praefectus*.

L. ✠ S.

✠ PETRUS LA FONTAINE, *Episc. Charystien., Secretarius*.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

FROM WASHINGTON TO ROOSEVELT. A Collection of Essays on the American Revolution, with other Historical Studies and Personal Impressions of America. By Very Rev. James O'Boyle, B.A., P.P., V.F. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, Ltd. 1911.

THIS is a very interesting work, and deserves wide recognition. We have scarcely met with a more succinct and more readable account of the American War of Independence. There are certain aspects of the struggle more fully dealt with by Mr. Bryce in his *American Commonwealth*; but as a popular account of the great contest we doubt if there is better to be had. In a series of essays short, bright, and crisp, the author deals with the main incidents of the revolution and with its principal personages. He contrasts Napoleon and Washington, much to the detriment of the former, too much so we should think; for after all, Washington had a more direct and simple object in view, and all was not shadow on the great Emperor. The events that preceded the revolution are rapidly sketched, and then we suddenly find ourselves at Lexington and Concord, at Bunker's Hill, at Wyoming and Yorktown. The treason of Arnold and the death of Major André are graphically related. The part taken by Irishmen in the revolution gets a chapter to itself. Having dealt with the great rebellion and the Declaration of Independence, Father O'Boyle then comes down to present-day American life, to recent Democratic and Republican conventions, to Roosevelt, the most strenuous man of a strenuous race. The 'St. Louis Exhibition' and 'The Red Man' bring the volume to a close.

Our only serious fault with the book is that it leaves such a wide gap between Washington and Roosevelt. We should have been very glad to get sketches of the Civil War in the same style as those on the War of Independence; pen-portraits of General Lee, of Jefferson Davis and Stonewall Jackson, of Abe Lincoln, Ulysses S. Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, and the old *Fabius Cunctator*, M'Clelland. We should have wished for a sketch of Garfield and M'Kinley, of Ben Butler and Boss Tweed. We

should have liked to get a peep into Tammany Hall, and an impression of Congress, and the caucuses that are said to work it. We should like to have something less one-sided as an impression of the social life, habits, and customs of Americans. As in all countries there are very gentle folk amongst them, noble specimens of Christianity and humanity, nature's masterpieces and grace's finest products; but there are also some whose manners are decidedly new, whose range of ideas is rather circumscribed, whose language is too freely interspersed with expletives, and whose opinion of themselves and their country is not very artistically shaded. A judicious mixture of all that would please us better than unqualified admiration. How skilfully the thing is done by the Abbé Klein in his *Pays de la Vie Intense*, by M. Urbain Gohier, by René Doumic, by Claudio Jannet, and many other Frenchmen! All the same, we owe much to the Americans, and except in chaff we would not ruffle their feelings. Father O'Boyle has probably exceeded on the right side. Compliments are generally more relished than criticism, no matter how useful and merited it may be.

On the whole we are delighted with this book, and heartily recommend it to young men who want to know all about the War of Independence, and to the much larger public that is generally interested in American affairs.

J. F. H.

THE PRINCIPLES OF MORAL SCIENCE. An Essay by the Rev. Walter McDonald, D.D., Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd. 1910.

WE are happy to announce the appearance of the second edition of Dr. McDonald's book on *The Principles of Moral Science*. Neither the author nor the book itself need any introduction to the readers of the I. E. RECORD. Dr. McDonald's contributions to theological literature are known and appreciated wherever, in English-speaking countries at all events, an interest is taken in the modern developments of Catholic apologetics. And, apart from the interest aroused by the first appearance of the work, the controversy it gave rise to, in the pages of the I. E. RECORD, between the author and a distinguished member

of the Jesuit Order, will have made our readers familiar with his main positions and the lines of argument on which they are based.

Notwithstanding the criticism to which the book has been subjected, the author sees no reason to modify the views he expressed in the first edition. Rather the reverse. The connexion between the morality of actions and their reference to man's ultimate end has been emphasized in ethical treatises lately published: Dr. McDonald, who refuses to regard the connexion as essential, replies with a friendly but firm, criticism of the opposing views, and finds in the difficulties they present further proofs of his own principles (pp. 147-151). Probabilists have been as energetic as ever in claiming the authority of the teaching Church for the system they favour: the author's answer is found in a note incorporating a letter of Innocent XI. to his Nuncio in Spain making it evident that the Pope was no enthusiastic admirer of less probable opinions (page 259). Professing disciples of the Kantian school have taken umbrage at the treatment their master receives in the first edition. They were given, we must grant, considerable provocation. 'The most important sentences and paragraphs,' Dr. McDonald had said in reference to Kant's writings, 'have a philosophic ring, but no intelligible meaning; and unintelligible premises lead to conclusions still more unintelligible; with the result that one is almost lulled to sleep with the regular recurrence of words and phrases which, vague in themselves and disconnected with one another, have scarce more power than the plash of falling water to rouse the attention and keep it alert' The explanation of Kant's influence he found in the fact that 'by reason of its misty phraseology it provides a means of escape from the arguments of the Materialists; somewhat as, when Homer found his heroes in difficulties and yet did not want to have them killed just then, he called in the aid of some god or goddess to envelop them in fog. . . . Professors in our universities are impelled by association more than by conviction to maintain religious views; and seeing that whatever scientific convictions they have are on the side of materialism, naught remains but either to resist the force of associations, which is still too strong for them, or to envelop their own and their unfortunate pupils' minds in mist.' The defence attempted by the admirers of Kant has had no effect on the author. He merely puts forward a few more difficulties against the German philosopher's position, and

challenges proof that 'Kant's is anything else than an ethics-made-easy system of moral science' (page xi.).

It goes without saying that the main portion of the book is devoted to an exposition and defence, though often on original lines, of doctrines on which practically all Catholic philosophers and theologians are agreed. His chapters on the Moral Order, Right and Wrong, Utilitarianism, Indifferent Acts, Duty, Responsibility and Free Will, Religion and Morality, Concupiscence and Fear, etc., differ little in substance from the corresponding sections in other Catholic manuals; though there is a clearness in the exposition, and a freshness and vigour in the style, that can hardly be said to be characteristic of philosophical treatises in general. As an instance of vivid style and highly reasonable criticism we would recommend our readers to consult his treatment of Spencer's contention that 'the sense of duty or moral obligation is transitory, and will diminish as fast as moralization increases.' He pictures Spencer's millennium: 'Labour and self-sacrifice will become a pleasure and the passions will be reversed; with the result that the highest satisfaction will be found in helping and gratifying others, and the only restraint on this universal altruism will be the fear that others may be deprived of the pleasure of self-sacrifice. Masters and mistresses will be restrained from sweeping chimneys and cleaning out sewers, from cooking the dinner and washing the plates, as cabinet ministers and artists will be kept from turning colliers and smelters, only from sympathy with the sweep and the cook, the collier and the smelter, of the future, whose whole hearts will be set on sweating and soiling themselves in the service of others.' He has little difficulty in exposing the tissue of fallacies that underlie the Utopian dream (pages 163-170).

In other sections he breaks away from the common teaching, though always on the strength of facts and principles admitted by the best exponents of Catholic tradition. He denies, for instance, the existence of a purely penal law; utilizes, to a greater degree than any other writer with whom we are acquainted, the concept of philosophical morality to discredit the theory that the ultimate end is the supreme criterion of the morality of actions; excludes the idea of freedom from morality by an appeal to the universally-admitted reality of material sin; discards the time-honoured principle regarding an act that is followed by a good and an evil effect; and, after upsetting the rival theories of Probabilism, Equiprobabilism and Probabiliorism,

sets up a system of his own which will confirm, in turn according to the circumstances, the conclusions of each, but always on a different principle.

To say that the work will be severely criticized is merely to say that the author has refused to follow the line of least resistance and has carved out a course for himself. And his critics will, of course, find here and there points to which they may fairly take exception. When he says, for instance (page 190), that the first condition usually demanded for the lawfulness of an act that is followed by two effects, an evil and a good—viz., 'that the action viewed in itself must be good, or at least indifferent'—'involves the whole question at issue,' and that the problem really is 'to know whether the action is good in itself when its effects are good as well as evil,' the defenders of the principle may fairly answer that the 'action in itself' means 'the action apart from the two effects in question,' not 'the action with all its effects,' as his criticism implies. Independently of the two effects, the act will have a morality of its own, which may, and should, be determined antecedently. A man knows, for example, that a certain remark he is thinking of making will benefit his friends but ruin his enemies. Is he justified in making it? By an application of the first condition he sees that, if the statement be a lie, his conduct will be immoral no matter how good the incidental effects. The condition may be very elementary, but is very reasonable as far as it goes.

Or they may complain when he says that, in the Probabilist view, the violation of a doubtful law entails no material sin even though the law really exists (pages 244-5). As far as we can see, the position really is that, notwithstanding the possibility of material sin, the person who acts on the probable opinion commits no formal sin and is not to be held responsible. And there is nothing unreasonable about the supposition. Even on Dr. McDonald's own principles, a man would often be free to act, even though his action would entail the violation of a moral order really existing but not sufficiently brought home to his consciousness. The law would 'bind' objectively, though the agent would not be held accountable. And this, as Dr. McDonald himself partially grants later on (pages 246 sqq.), is, we believe, all that the Probabilist maintains.

Apart from this, the author's remarks on Probabilism are, we think, thoroughly justified, and must be taken into account by everyone who undertakes to defend Probabilism as a scientific

system. The restrictions imposed by Probabilists themselves, even in cases where there is question merely of lawfulness, lead one sometimes to doubt whether they really believe in the scientific accuracy of their fundamental principle. But may it not be that the principle, though not absolutely true in theory, can be accepted as a tolerably safe guide in practice all the same? Most of the practical maxims left us by the wisdom of our predecessors are of that description: exceptions may be taken to their universal truth, but they give good results in ordinary life. If the plain man could, in all cases of doubt, accurately estimate the evils on both sides and measure impartially the strength of conflicting opinions, he would be well advised to adopt the system proposed by Dr. McDonald—it would always give him a scientifically accurate result. But, unfortunately, he can do nothing of the kind. The attempt would leave him absorbed all his life in a contemplation of speculative probabilities. He needs an easier method; one that, apart from exceptional circumstances for which special provision must be made, will give him a tolerably accurate result in the vast majority of practical difficulties he meets in ordinary life. And we think that Dr. McDonald, fully alive though he is to the defects of Probabilism, would grant that the system fulfils the conditions.

We hope we have said enough to bring the book again to the notice of any of our readers who have not seen it already. It is a delightful contrast to the ordinary type of philosophical manual. There is nothing vague or misty in the style, and the reader is never in doubt about the meaning intended. It will give Catholics an idea of the interest and charm with which a writer like Dr. McDonald can invest the most technical details of the system they profess. And to those outside our Church it will open up a new world for reflection and research, one in which the philosophic theories of the present are viewed impartially in the light of nineteen centuries of Catholic thought.

M. J. O'D.

SORROW FOR SIN. MUST IT BE SUPREME? By Rev.
E. Nagle, S.T.L. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd.

THE main purpose of this essay is to give an answer to the question: Is the fear of hell-fire a sufficient motive for attrition in the sacrament of Penance? The question itself is sufficiently arrestive, and the answer must be confessedly of vital import.

An affirmative seems the only answer possible, if we consider that hell-fire is such a favourite theme of pulpit oratory, especially during missions and retreats. But our assurance meets a check, if we reflect that, for attrition, on the admission of all, you require some kind of conversion to God, whereas the fear of hell-fire does not necessarily imply any degree of conversion at all. And here we may remark, in passing, that the reverend author appears to unduly prejudice the case in favour of an affirmative verdict, when he states that all our catechisms preach the sufficiency of this motive—we say unduly, for the loss of heaven can be considered either from the point of view of one under threat of sentence, or from the point of view of one on whom sentence of final exclusion has been already passed.

The essay runs to 113 pages, and is divided into eight chapters. Chapter I. is introductory. Chapter II. states, and very clearly and fairly, the reasons for the strict view—(1) from the necessity of sorrow being *supreme*, a quality which does not seem to be realized in attrition from fear of hell-fire; (2) from the necessity of some kind of *conversion*, as a condition of sacramental remission; (3) from the necessity of *hope*, as an essential prerequisite; and (4) from the teaching of the Sixth Session of the Council of Trent. In Chapters III., IV., V., VI., Father Nagle combats these arguments in the order of their statement.

The question of divine hope, which is dealt with in Chapter V., is possibly treated at undue length for the requirements of unity and good perspective. But one quite forgets this defect in the reading, for this is the most convincing and the most brilliant chapter in the book. Chapters VII. and VIII. are supplementary. The former discusses the relations between the love of concupiscence and the love of charity, and the latter takes Father Faber mildly to task for some opinions and expressions, savouring of laxity, with reference to sorrow and purpose of amendment in his book *The Creator and the Creature*.

We rather sympathize with Father Nagle in this connexion. For while sharing this admiration for the great Oratorian, we confess to an occasional sense of annoyance, when Father Faber's exuberant fancy outsteps the limits of strict theological accuracy of expression, as it often does; and we feel tempted to repeat to ourselves what Newman said of him on one occasion, while they were both of the Church of England: 'I wish that he would not write so much.'

The style bespeaks the man. The essay under review is the breeziest exposition of a theological subject it has been our good fortune to read for many a day. And the book is also both clever and sincere. It scintillates with good things and pulsates with nervous logic. And there is no shirking or confusing of the issue, no refusal to face difficulties or grapple with them. Strong in the consciousness of triple armour, Father Nagle strides along his course with a restrained yet ever-recurring note of triumph.

And yet, he has left us unconvinced. Indeed, we believe his cause hopeless, his case unprovable. And this for two reasons: First, because sorrow for sin, from fear of hell-fire, though it necessarily begets a relatively supreme shrinking from sin, does not of necessity imply a conversion to God in any degree whatsoever. And, secondly, we believe that the thesis asserting the sufficiency of such a motive cannot be brought into line with the teaching of the Sixth Session of the Council of Trent, except at the expense of the recognized canons of exegesis.

The fear of hell-fire has its place, however, in the supernatural economy. For there are some phases and conditions of temptation in which it is a sure and most necessary deterrent. And when a soul is in sin, though this servile sense-fear may not be sufficient for sacramental conciliation, it will most efficaciously help to initiate the process of conversion—it will lead the sinner to the feet of the confessor. And once there, it will be strange if, by the grace of God and the help of the Lord's ambassador, the penitent cannot be tuned up to a sorrow, supreme and strong, from the thought of the wounded Hands and Feet, the bleeding Side and the breaking Heart, of the God who died for even such as he.

The book is admirably produced. And, if varied information, clear thinking, daringly happy phrasing, brisk, unhalting movement from start to finish, and a forceful undercurrent of devotional earnestness, constitute a claim to recognition—this essay should be within easy hand-reach of every missionary priest and every theological student.

D. D.

HANDBUCH ZUR BIBLISCHEN GESCHICHTE. Erster Band : Das Alte Testament. Bearbeitet von Dr. Joseph Selbst. Zweiter Band : Das Neue Testament. Bearbeitet von Dr. Jakob Schäfer. Schuster und Holzammer

THIS work is no longer a simple sketch of Bible history. It has now become an encyclopædia of Biblical science. It is at once a compendious commentary on all the books of the Old and New Testaments, a handbook of scientific introduction, and an excellent manual of Biblical apologetics. It summarizes carefully the results of all the most important recent archaeological work in Bible lands, and gives a very good account of extra-Biblical Oriental history. There is no other book in any language which brings together such a mass of reliable information for the Catholic student of Scripture as is to be found in this *Handbuch*. For students in ecclesiastical seminaries, and for teachers who have to give religious instruction, these two volumes will be of very great value. The publication of the *Handbuch* in English would meet a decided want in English-speaking countries, and it may be taken for granted that the enterprising firm of Herder will not fail to bring its splendid publication soon within reach of the English-speaking public. The two learned editors and the publishing firm deserve to be congratulated very cordially on the excellence of their work.

THE RECTOR AND THE FATHERS; OR THE THEOLOGICAL METHODS OF REV. W. J. KERR, B.D., examined by Rev. J. Nolan, P.P., Kirkubbin. Belfast: Catholic Book Company. 1911.

PREACHERS of error and maligners of the Catholic Church are not going to have it all their own way, judging by the activity and zeal of Catholics to refute and confound them. This pamphlet of Father Nolan's is another instance of this activity. It is an able and learned reply to some of the attacks made upon the Church in his part of the country, and indicates a wide knowledge of Patristic and theological literature, as well as a just appreciation of the character of some of the assailants of Catholicism.

When an apostate priest appeared, now a good many years ago, before the British public, denouncing the superstition of

Catholicism, and the inquisition of Rome, Dr. Newman, then happily at the height of his fame, took off his coat to him and his class, and in a philippic which, of its kind, has never been surpassed, left them a sorry sight for all the world to see. Having given a graphic sketch of the mean and squalid persecution of Catholics carried out in his day by the British public, he turned with scathing sarcasm on its most unctuous representatives, 'wiping their mouths' and 'turning up their eyes' and trotting away to the nearest hall to hear an ex-friar on the tyrannies of the Inquisition:—

'The Protestant world flocks to hear him, because he has something to tell of the Catholic Church. He has something to tell, it is true. He has a scandal to reveal, he has an argument to exhibit. It is a simple one, and a powerful one, as far as it goes; and it is *one*. That one argument is himself. It is his presence that is the triumph of Protestants; it is the sight of him which is a Catholic's confusion. It is, indeed, our great confusion that our Holy Mother could have had a priest like him. He feels the force of the argument, and he shows himself to the multitude that is gazing on him. "Mothers of families," he seems to say, "gentle maidens, innocent children, look at me: for I am worth looking at. You do not see such a sight every day. Can any Church live over the imputation of such a production as I am?"'

He then goes on to enumerate the crimes of which the reformer had been guilty, and he continues:—

'Yes! you are an incontrovertible proof that priests may fall and friars break their vows. You are your own witness: but while you *need* not go out of yourself for your argument, neither are you *able*. With you the argument begins; with you too it ends: the beginning and the end you are both. When you have shown yourself you have done your worst and your all. You are your best argument and your sole. Your witness against others is utterly invalidated by your witness against yourself. You have left your sting in the wound. You cannot lay the golden eggs, for you are already dead.'

Father Nolan had not quite the same type of antagonists to deal with, but by the evidence he produces some of them are their own most effective refutation. We congratulate Father Nolan very cordially on his useful and able pamphlet.

J. F. H.

MEDITATIONES DE PRAECIPUIS FIDEI NOSTRAE MYSTERIIS.

By the Ven. P. L. De Ponte, S.J.; translated into Latin from the Spanish by Melchior Trevvinnio, S.J.; edited by A. Lehmkuhl, S.J. Second edition. Freiburg and London: Herder.

DE PONTE'S *Meditations* have been known and prized all over the world for more than two centuries in the Latin version of Trevvinnio. They are among the best meditations ever composed for the use of the clergy, of religious, and of the devout laity. Priests will find them invaluable as mines of solid and edifying doctrine on which they can draw with profit for the instruction of their people no less than for their own sanctification. They deal exhaustively with all the mysteries of the Christian faith; they are almost built up from the Sacred Scriptures, so copious are the texts throughout; and they breathe the genuine, humble spirit of Christian piety on every page.

Father Lehmkuhl—whose name is an ample guarantee of excellent work—has deserved well of the whole Catholic clergy in bringing out the present very handy and convenient edition. We have no hesitation in recommending it to the clergy everywhere. The Latin is exceedingly simple; the form of the meditations is attractive—though each is long it is broken up into a number of points or sections to meet the need of shorter exercises. The volumes are neatly printed by Herder's well-known firm, and may be had in cloth binding as well as in paper.

P. C.

THE LIFE OF FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE. By Daniel Halévy.

Translated by J. M. Hone, with an Introduction by T. M. Kettle, M.P. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1911.

THE idea of Evolution, in some shape or another, is the one which has most modified European thought during the last half-century. Starting in the domain of Palæontology, it has extended itself into every sphere of human knowledge. It has given a new zest to the historical study of all forms of science, and has supplied a more or less new method. The method, especially as followed in German universities, tended, whilst guided by this theory, to eliminate the personal equation: men, or rather the professors, gloried in recording everything,—everything save themselves. They registered life-forms from say a

trilobite to a dinosaur, and from a dinosaur to an anthropoid ape ; they described the distribution of each species ; they noted the earliest forms of Greek or Egyptian art and tracked its growth in the past ; they described the evolution of a primitive saga literature into a medieval literature influenced by Christianity, and the passage of the latter into a modern literature, the outcome of medievalism and the Renaissance ; they traced, in the historical sphere, the growth of forms of government, of laws and customs ; in religion they have been patiently gathering together the evidences of belief in another world or in a power above man or at least controlling man. They have gradually come to believe that by delving in the past they may find the key to the present and, in some cases, to the future ; and the path to a final solution seems almost choked with the material they have unearthed. They flattered the democratic sense of the age by a theory that held everything to be interesting, but interesting, as they would say, 'historically.' But as everything came to be viewed 'historically,' there crept in the feeling that finality in anything, save in a very remote sense, was not to be hoped for ; and thus relativism became the philosophic resting-place of most non-Catholic scientists. The finality of the moral perfection of Christ was a stumbling-block to their theory, and, denying His Divinity, He became for them one of the great moral teachers of the world, but nothing more.

Whilst thoroughly imbued with and accepting the anti-Christian teaching of German scholarship, Nietzsche was dissatisfied with its negative character. The lyrical temper of his mind made him more akin to the prophet than to the historical scientist, and the history of his life is the history of an attempt to propose a solution of the problem which Evolution had posed for him, an attempt which the university professors of his day seemed to him unwilling or unable to make. It was this anxiety for an immediate solution of the question that led to the ignoring of his work in German scientific circles. To spring prophetically into the future, and forecast the final and ideal type, the superman, through which mankind should strive to pass, offended two schools of evolutionary thought : it offended the strictly historical school, who considered it futile to prophesy of the future ; it offended the *laissez-faire* school, who, whilst they believed that man would evolve into something higher, still held that selection should be a mechanical and not a conscious process. Nietzsche not alone placed a term to man's progress but also

laid down a method: the method was, to crush out the weak and unfit amongst men, and to encourage the strong in body and in mind. Christian charity was, for him, but a conspiracy to retard the onward progress of the race, and the Beatitudes seemed to him but the rallying song of retrogressiveness. For the poor, the mourning ones, the meek, the peacemakers, he would substitute the powerful, the joyous ones, the proud, those who love war. Nietzsche's view is derived from his denial of God: the law of life for him was not the law as revealed in the conscience and in Revelation, but as revealed in Nature, and in Nature as interpreted by most of the Evolutionists of the last fifty years. Like many of the opponents of Christianity he makes easy the road to its overthrow by setting up his own idea of it. For instance, when he interprets the Beatitudes in words such as the following it is easy to see that the bugbear that oppresses him is of his own creation: he paraphrases them thus: 'The wretched alone are the good; the poor, the impotent, the lowly alone are good; only the sufferers, the needy, the sick, the ugly are pious, only they are godly; them alone blessedness awaits—but ye, the proud and potent, ye are for aye and evermore the wicked, the cruel, the lustful, the insatiable, the godless; ye will also be, to all eternity, the unblest, the cursed and the damned.' And the poor, impotent, lowly, needy, sick, ugly shades of Gregory the Great, of Charlemagne, of Joan of Arc, of St. Francis of Assisi rise up, and, of course, acquiesce!

Nietzsche's doctrine of the super-man was fortified by his theory of the Will to Power. The universe for him was not the outcome of a beneficent intelligence but of Will striving to realize its object and crushing through mistakes towards its prophetic ideal. Its ideal was in humanity the super-man, and two of its most serious mistakes, Christianity and Alcohol! Finally, Nietzsche added an Apocalypse to his Gospel. *The Eternal Return* supplied a vision of the future which set his super-man at rest as to his ultimate fate. It gave him a kind of intermittent immortality; and so gave Nietzsche, in his own opinion, a claim to be considered an optimist. Notwithstanding the clamorous cries of an active band of disciples, Nietzsche's philosophy can scarcely lay claim to originality. What is original in him is his style. It has that quality of directness which produces the sensation of the living voice.


The Life of Nietzsche by Halévy gives us a clear insight into

the development of his strange mind. The son of a Lutheran pastor, he was born at Röcken, October 15, 1844. He was first educated at Pforta, near Naumburg, and thence entered the University of Bonn, where he distinguished himself in Philology. His work on Theognis of Megara won him the admiration of his master, Ritschl. He continued his studies at Leipsic, where he met Rohde. The reading of Schopenhauer's *The World as Will and Representation* helped to turn him from Philology to Philosophy, and many of his characteristic ideas may be traced to Schopenhauer. His meeting with Wagner was one of the chief events in his life. He looked to Wagner to bring about that break with the past by means of music which Nietzsche had set himself to do by means of his philosophy. As Wagner fell back, especially in 'Parsifal,' on Christian and medieval themes, Nietzsche came reluctantly to look upon him as a traitor to the new movement. On leaving Leipsic he was appointed Professor at Basle. During the Franco-Prussian War he served as ambulancer; and the illness contracted during the campaign laid the foundation of his future ill-health. While at Basle he wrote *The Birth of Tragedy, Thoughts out of Season, Schopenhauer as Educator*, and *Human, All Too Human*. In 1879, owing to continued ill-health, he resigned his professorship, and from this time roamed from place to place in search of relief from suffering. At war with the prevailing ideas in his native country, he produced in exile the works by which now he is chiefly known: *The Dawn of Day, Thus Spake Zarathustra, Beyond Good and Evil, The Will to Power, The Genealogy of Morals*, etc. It is interesting to note that in his later years he somewhat modified his views as to Democracy and Christianity: 'The humanitarian tendencies,' he wrote, 'are not anti-vital, they suit the masses who live slowly, and they suit humanity which needs the satisfaction of the masses. The Christian tendencies are also benevolent, and nothing is so desirable as their permanence'; and again, in 1881, he wrote to Peter Gast: 'Whatever I may happen to say of Christianity I cannot forget that I owe to it the best experiences of my spiritual life; and I hope never to be ungrateful to it at the bottom of my heart.' Ill-health, extending over years, the excessive use of chloral and, possibly, other drugs, and the tendency to cerebral trouble inherited from his father led to the gradual break-down of his intellect. In these later days he wrote *The Case of Wagner, The Twilight of the Gods*, and *Ecce Homo*. Two distinguished European men of

letters, Taine in France and Georges Brandes in Denmark, had set themselves to popularise his work ; but Nietzsche had barely time to learn of the growing recognition of his writings when madness seized him. The final blow fell upon him in 1889, and on August 25, 1890, he passed away at Weimar.

The Life of Nietzsche by Halévy gives an accurate and un-biassed account of his career. It contrasts most favourably with the violently partisan and propagandist sketch by Ludovici, published by Constable & Co. The translation by J. M. Hone is well done, and an Introduction is furnished by Mr. T. M. Kettle. Mr. Kettle ends his brilliant appreciation of Nietzsche by registering his work as a poison in the pharmacopœia of Philosophy, 'Nietzsche,' says Mr. Kettle, 'brings a sort of ethical strychnine which taken in large doses is fatal, but in small doses is an incomparable tonic.'

P. M'S.



SOME CELTIC MISSIONARY SAINTS

BY way of introduction to these short studies of 'Some Celtic Missionary Saints' it may be useful to give at least some slight sketch and general outline of the origins of Celtic Christianity, and of the beginnings and first formation of the Early Celtic Church in Ireland. The first mention of Celtic Christianity is to be found in the pages of the New Testament. The Galatians, to whom St. Paul addressed one of his Epistles, were Celts. The Anglican Bishop Lightfoot, in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, as well as Douglas Hyde, in his *Literary History of Ireland*, dwell at considerable length upon the historical significance of this fact. The inhabitants of Gaul, to whom Christianity came during the first century and who had St. Irenæus, the disciple of St. Polycarp, amongst them as the second Bishop of Lyons, were undoubtedly a Celtic people, whose language so closely resembled the Irish Gaelic tongue that a Gallic Druidical inscription discovered some years ago, the meaning of which puzzled French scholars, was easily deciphered when submitted to a professor of the Royal Irish Academy at Dublin. The limits, however, of our subject will confine us to the consideration of the origins of Celtic Christianity only in so far as it was destined to survive, and become the prolific soil and seed-bed of that early Celtic Church in Ireland which was to be the nursing mother of missionary

saints and apostles, and of the founders of churches throughout the world. The island of Britain which became part of the Roman dominions fifty-five years before the Christian era, constituted the extreme north-western limit of the empire. The Roman arms never penetrated to that island situated to the west of Britain, and known to the ancients by the names of Ierne, Iverna, Hibernia, or Scotia. After the middle of the fifth century North Britain received the name of Scotia Minor from the fact of a colony or settlement made there from Scotia Major, the ancient name of Ireland. This colony or settlement was made from that part of Ireland called Dalriada, the district bordering on Lough Neagh and the modern Belfast, and gave its name of Dalriada to what is now Argyllshire in Scotland.

The inhabitants of Ireland were commonly spoken of by ancient and early medieval writers as Scots. St. Jerome, in the fourth century, so named them. Orosius, in the fifth century, called them Scots; and Gildas, in the sixth century, speaks of Ireland as Scotia, and that name was used to designate Ireland in the twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and up to the fifteenth century. As regards the origins of Christianity in Britain, though very obscure, they are undoubtedly bound up and connected with the fact of its being a province of the Roman Empire. We have the testimony of Tertullian in his sixth homily on the Gospel of St. Luke, written probably about the year 208, to the fact that Christianity had already at that date reached as far as Britain, and therefore it can hardly be doubted that there were Christians in Britain as early as the end of the second century. In all probability the first Christians in Britain would have been amongst the troops of the Roman legions, as well, perhaps, as amongst the numerous traders between Britain and the Continent, who came in their wake during the second and third centuries. For if St. Paul in his Epistles can tell us, as he does, that Christianity had already penetrated into Cæsar's household, it is difficult to suppose that it had not penetrated, at least to some small extent, wherever the Roman legions were stationed. I remember seeing, in 1870, in the ruins of the palace of the

Cæsars on the Palatine at Rome, the famous *graffito*, shortly after it had been discovered in the stables of the Pretorian Guard, representing a Roman soldier worshipping the figure of an ass fastened to a cross. It was then still in its original site, and had not been removed, as it was shortly afterwards, to the Museum of Christian Antiquities in the Lateran Palace. Well, it is hard to imagine how a Roman soldier could have drawn such a caricature of a comrade-in-arms unless the Christian profession, or at least the Christian proclivities of some amongst the Pretorian Guard, were more or less matters of common knowledge at the time.

But, however this may have been, and whatever the date of this *graffito* from the palace of the Cæsars, it is at any rate quite certain that when we come to the reign of Diocletian, extending from the year 284 to 305, we find ourselves on firm historical ground regarding the existence of Christianity in Britain; for it was during the persecution of the Christians under that emperor that the protomartyr of the British Church, St. Alban, suffered martyrdom at Verulam, named afterwards St. Albans. Moreover, at the beginning of the reign of Constantine, who was proclaimed Emperor whilst with the Roman troops in Britain, and who became the first Christian Emperor in the year 315, there certainly existed in Britain a fully-organized Christian Church; for the names are on record of three British Bishops who assisted at the Council of Arles in 314. But not only have we records of an organized Christian Church in Britain in the fourth century, but we have also historical accounts of the breaking-out during that century in the British Church of a most pestilential heresy concerning the doctrine of grace, the heresy, namely, of Pelagianism, which spread itself throughout the Christian world, and which gave rise to some of the finest writings which have come to us from the pen of that stupendous genius and illustrious Father of the Church, Augustine, Bishop of Hippo Regius, one of the four great doctors of the Latin Church. It was the Pelagian heresy which caused the mission of St. Germanus of Auxerre to Britain in the capacity of

Delegate-Apostolic to Pope St. Celestine the First, and St. Lupus of Troyes was induced by the Bishops of Gaul to accompany him. This was in the year 429. There are reasons which make it seem probable that the Pelagian heresy must at this date have penetrated further west than Britain, and reached the shores of Ireland. For we find Pope St. Celestine sending one Palladius, a disciple and companion of St. Germanus, as the first Delegate-Apostolic into that country. In any case it can be proved historically that there were already Christians in Ireland whose existence and condition were well known to St. Celestine; for Prosper of Aquitaine, who was then living, tell us in his chronicle, that 'in the year 431, under the Consulship of Bassus and Antiochus, Palladius was consecrated by Pope St. Celestine, and sent to the Scots believing in Christ.' This is a sufficiently important historical fact to be borne in mind, because it shows us that there were already Christians in Ireland before the coming of St. Patrick. It will therefore be useful, and even necessary, to see what history can show us concerning the first recorded presence of Christianity in Ireland, in order to obtain a correct notion of the origins and beginnings of the early Celtic Church. The duration of the mission of Palladius in Ireland was very brief, for it only lasted a year, and the field of his missionary labours was very confined, for it only affected a very small area, represented on the map of Ireland by the present County of Wicklow. It was at what is now the town of Wicklow that he landed with his companions. Here, it would seem, and in its neighbourhood, were to be found those scattered few amongst the Irish 'who believed in Christ' to whom Palladius was sent by Pope St. Celestine.

The mission of Palladius to Ireland was certainly regarded from one point of view a failure, for it accomplished little or nothing towards the evangelization of that country. But viewed from another standpoint, and looked at in its true historical perspective, it furnishes a most instructive object-lesson concerning the source and the first beginnings of Irish Christianity. For, if the mission of Palladius was a failure, it shows us none the less the Roman

Pontiff as the Supreme Pastor of Christendom already claiming and exercising the universal jurisdiction of the Apostolic See in the early years of the fifth century over the inhabitants of one of the remotest regions of the earth, beyond the limits of the Roman Empire. It shows us, too, how the first initiative of the Celtic Church came from no other source than the mind and action of the Bishop of Rome. Starting in apparent failure, it was destined, nevertheless, to survive and continue with a success which has never been surpassed or even equalled in the history of Christian missionary enterprise. Whilst the British Church, which began with martyrs, and sent its Bishops to sit in general Councils, and which for a time was so distinguished for its saints, its scholars, and its Christian schools, ended none the less in corruption and degeneracy; and speedily disappeared before the invading Saxons, for whose conversion it had no mind and made no attempt. St. Bede has composed its epitaph in these words: 'They never preached the Faith to the Saxon or English who dwelt amongst them.'¹ There remain, as might naturally be expected, but few traces of the short-lived mission of Palladius in Ireland. Professor Bury, Regius Professor of Modern History at the University of Cambridge, has, however, in his *Life of St. Patrick*, called attention to them:—

Between the port where Wicklow of the Vikings now is [he writes], the port where Palladius landed, and the lonely glen of the two lakes [Glendalough], by whose shores a cluster of churches was afterwards to spring up, stretched the lands of the Children of Garrchu, and tradition said that the Chief of this tribe regarded Palladius with disfavour. But this short sojourn is also associated with the foundation of three churches. It is possible that we may seek the site of a little House for Praying, built by him or his disciples, on a high wooded hill that rises sheer enough on the left bank of the river Avoca, close to a long slanting hollow, down which, over grass or bushes, the eye catches the glimmer of the stream winding in the vale below, and rises beyond to the higher hills which bound the horizon. Here may have been the

¹ *Eccl. Hist.*, lib. i. c. xxii.

'House of the Romans' (*Tech na Róman*), and Tigroney, the shape in which this name is concealed, may be a memorial of the first Missionary of Rome. But further west, beyond the hills, we can determine with less uncertainty another place which tradition associated with the activity of Palladius, in the neighbourhood of one of the royal seats of the Lords of Leinster. From the high Rath of Dunlavin those kings had a wide survey of their realm. Standing there, one can see westwards to Mount Bladma, and northward, across the plain of Liffey, into the kingdom of Meath. More than a league eastward from this fortress Palladius is said to have founded a church which was known as the 'Domnach' or 'Lord's House of the High-Field,' 'Domnach airte,' in a hilly region which is strewn with the remnants of ancient generations. The original church of this place has long since vanished, and its precise site cannot be guessed with certainty, but it gave its permanent name to the place. At Donard we feel with some assurance that we are at one of the earliest homes of the Christian Faith in Ireland, not the earliest that existed, but the earliest to which we can give a name. There was a third church, seemingly the most important of those which Palladius is said to have founded, 'Kill Fine,' 'The Church of the Tribes,' in which his tablets and certain books and relics which he had brought from Rome were preserved. Here, and perhaps here only, in the place, unknown to us where his relics lay, was preserved the memory of Palladius, a mere name. Whatever his qualities may have been, he was too short a time in Ireland to have produced a permanent impression. The historical significance of his presence there does not lie in any slight ecclesiastical or theological successes he may have accomplished. It is significant because it was the first manifestation in Ireland of the authority of Rome. The secular arm of Rome—in days when Rome was mightier—the arm of Agricola, the arm of Theodosius, had never reached the Scottic coast; it was not till after the Mother of the Empire had been besieged and despoiled by barbarian invaders that her new spiritual dominion began to reach out, to those remote shores which her worldly power had never sought to gain. The coming of Palladius was the first link in the chain which bound Ireland to the spiritual centre of Western Europe. . . . The essential point is that by the sending of Palladius Ireland had become one of the Western Churches, and therefore, like its fellows, looked to the See of Rome as the highest authority in Christendom. Unless, at the

very moment of incorporation, they were to repudiate the unity of the Church, the Christians of Ireland could not look with other eyes than the Christians of Gaul at the appellate jurisdiction of the Roman Bishop, and the moral weight of his decretals.¹

It would, I think, be difficult to find a stronger or a more unbiassed testimony to the Roman origin of the Celtic Church than the Regius Professor of Modern History of Cambridge has given us in the foregoing words: a testimony all the more remarkable as coming from one who was formerly a fellow of that stronghold of Protestant ascendancy and prejudice, Trinity College, Dublin, from whence, years before, had issued the famous life of St. Patrick by Dr. Todd, wherein that great saint is depicted as a kind of premature Protestant missionary, or apostolic free-lance, entirely independent of the authority of the Roman See. It was the failure of the mission of Palladius that gave occasion, in the order of Divine Providence, to the mission of St. Patrick, who was destined to become not only the first apostle of the Gael and the founder of the Celtic Church, but the father and prototype of those legions of apostolic missionary saints who were to carry his faith and spirit throughout the whole world, and to the utmost ends of the earth. Although it does not come within the scope of this paper to treat of the life and mission of St. Patrick, it will, nevertheless, be necessary, if we are to understand the ethos and spirit of the early missionary saints of the Celtic Church, to grasp thoroughly the dominating fact of the deep-rooted and steadfast fidelity to the See of Rome which characterized and permeated the whole of the work and teaching of St. Patrick. It was this deep-rooted and steadfast fidelity to the Apostolic See which he bequeathed as a legacy to his spiritual children; and it is this chiefly which has given that undying permanence, power of growth, and ever-fresh expansion to the work of this saint with which there is nothing to compare in the whole history of Christianity. Enshrined in the pages of the most ancient and venerable volume of North-western Europe, which

¹ *Life of St. Patrick*, c. iii.

represents the most precious treasure of the Library of Trinity College in Dublin, can still be read what are styled the 'Sayings of St. Patrick' (*Dicta Sancti Patritii*), together with the decrees of synods held during his lifetime. The *Book of Armagh*, which contains these and other documents which date back to the lifetime of St. Patrick, is a compilation made before the year 807 for the purpose of collecting in one volume the writings of the saint, together with other contemporary documents relating to him. It contains the famous document entitled the 'Confession of St. Patrick,' and his 'Letter to Coroticus,' the 'Lorica,' and the earliest written Lives of the Saint. The *Dicta Sancti Patritii*, which have been preserved, are only three in number, and can therefore be easily remembered.

The first of the 'Sayings of St. Patrick' runs as follows : I. 'Timorem Dei habui ducem itineris mei per Gallias atque Italiam etiam in insulis quae sunt in mari Tyreno.'

The second is in these words : II. 'De saeculo recessistis ad Paradisum, Deo gratias.'

The third saying is the most famous and the most significant ; it runs thus : III. 'Ecclesia Scottorum, immo Romanorum, ut Christiani ita ut Romani sitis, ut decantetur vobiscum oportet, omni hora orationis, vox illa laudabilis Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison. Omnis ecclesia quae sequitur me cantet Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Deo gratias.'

Could there be stronger or more clear and explicit contemporary testimony than this to the intimate bond of union which united the early Celtic Church to the Roman See? But the *Dicta*, nevertheless, do not stand alone in proving the recognition by the first Irish Christians of the Primacy and Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome.

We possess also the Acts of a Synod held by St. Patrick before the year 448, in which it is decreed that : 'If any difficult questions should arise in this island, they are to be referred to the Apostolic See'—('Si quae difficiles questiones in hac insula oriantur, ad Sedem Apostolicam referantur').

At the end of the Acts of this Synod we can still read the signatures of those who made its decrees : 'Hii sunt qui de

hoc decreverunt, id est, Auxilius, Patricius, Secundinus, Benignus.' Auxilius, whose name appears first amongst the signatories of this first Synod of the Irish Church, was a companion of St. Patrick who was ordained priest together with the saint by St. Amator, the predecessor of St. Germanus in the See of Auxerre; and is it not indeed a touching token of the humility of the great apostle of the Gael to see how he has caused his friend and companion to attach his name before his own to the Acts of the first Synod of the Celtic Church? If there is one feature of that Church which stands out more clearly marked than any other, it is surely the way in which the teaching and spirit of St. Patrick has lived and survived in it during the whole course of its history. There is no other country whose apostle has continued to be such an ever-fresh living power and reality for its people as the apostle of Ireland ever has been and is still to the Irish people. Even a Protestant writer has been ready to acknowledge this fact:—

Not only [writes Borlase] was he the bringer of the Gospel, but he was also, in a sense, that intensely spiritual side of the Irish nature which was there already to receive it. To the heart and mind of the simplest peasant of to-day he is the link between earth and heaven. Take the patron saints of other countries—St. James, St. Denys, St. Andrew, St. David, St. George—they date but from the romance of chivalry,—Patrick is much more, He is one with the soil itself. As a giant of old he cleaves the mountain; he causes new lakes to arise; he leaves his impression on the rocks. As a man living in the fourth and fifth centuries, he teaches the Irish the faith of Christ; as a saint of to-day, he gathers to himself, not only from the four provinces of Erin, but from the four quarters of the earth, his scattered people and bids them, according to their own adage, 'leave their weapons outside the dining hall,' and celebrate his feast with harmony and mirth.¹

Let this suffice as an introduction to the study of 'Some Celtic Missionary Saints.' The landscape that now spreads itself before us is indeed a vast one; but it will be necessary

¹ *Age of the Saints*, p. 48.

to concentrate our gaze on a few only of its leading splendours. Beginning in the fifth century, it radiates as a brilliant sunburst from Ireland, and stretches away over well-nigh the entire Continent of Europe, and penetrates even, in one solitary instance, as if in prophetic vision, to the yet undiscovered shores of America. So that an eminent living archæologist has not scrupled to speak of Ireland as 'the second cradle of Christianity in the West.' The collective lives and labours of her early missionary saints would abundantly prove her historical right to that title. Here it may be well to call to mind that salient characteristic of the early Celtic Church which pre-eminently distinguished it, and that is, its all but exclusively monastic character. There is no recorded instance, with the possible exception of the Nile Desert, of such large numbers of monks and hermits springing up in any one part of the world, or in any period of the history of Christianity, as that afforded by the history of the early Celtic Church in Ireland. Her great apostle himself, although a Bishop, was also a true monk, trained in the monastic discipline in Gaul, and more especially in the island of Lerins, the famous home of St. Vincent, and where Cassian had brought from the East the monastic rule, together with the traditions learned from the Fathers of the Desert in Upper Egypt. No Church in Christendom has been so bound up with the monastic ideal as was the Church in Ireland. Its very government was often more monastic than episcopal, for many of its early Bishops were themselves under the rule of abbots, and this is one of those curious features which has presented so many difficulties to the student of Irish Church history. It is this monastic spirit and tone, derived from the East, and coming by way of Lerins and Gaul to Ireland, which has left its stamp in such a notable way upon all its Christian remains. It is seen in those enclosures or 'cashels,' with their clusters of beehive cells; it is seen in those groups of small churches, so often seven in number, the vestiges of which still exist at Glendalough, Inismurray, Clonmacnois, the Aran Isles, and elsewhere. It is seen, again, in those lofty and splendid round towers scattered

over the country, about which so much has been written, and whose history has for so long puzzled the antiquarian and the archæologist.

Hardly had Christianity been planted throughout Ireland by St. Patrick, where, unlike nearly every other case of national conversion, it was established without shedding the blood of martyrs, than the first disciples of the saint began to turn their attention to missionary enterprise and the conversion of other nations. It is almost certain that the first Christian missionaries went forth from Ireland even during the lifetime of St. Patrick. He is said, for instance, to have consecrated one of his own disciples as the first Bishop of the Isle of Man, which was probably the first place to receive its Christianity from Ireland. Then, already in the fifth century there set in that tide of apostolic emigration of missionary saints to the shores of Cornwall, that strangely mysterious tract of country, so full of ancient legendary lore, where there still lingers the shadowy memories of hosts of Irish anchorites, hermits, and missionary saints in the place-names of its districts, towns, and villages. By the beginning of the sixth century Cornwall was peopled with numbers of men and women from Ireland, who sought out places where they might be alone with God and nature in holy solitude, around whom there grew up those little Christian centres which afterwards became the monasteries, parishes, and towns of Cornwall. Borlase, a Cornishman, who has written an interesting work on the Cornish saints, tells us that he can never forget the advice given him at Oxford by his friend Max Müller, who said to him: 'If you really wish to go deeply into the antiquities of your country it is to Ireland you must go to learn about them.' However, since the barbarous destruction under Henry VIII. of the old Church service books of Catholic times, when, according to Maskell, some 250,000 missals, breviaries, and other books used in Church services were destroyed by royal command, it seems impossible to get to know any more about these Irish saints in Cornwall besides their names and certain delightfully extravagant and quaint legends.

I need hardly say that the existence of these same quaint and extravagant legends is an unmistakable proof of the extent of the popular devotion to them in Cornwall in the days when Cornwall was Catholic.

Extending our view beyond the Isle of Man and Cornwall, we next see the Irish missionary saints travelling further north and evangelizing Caledonia and North Britain as far south as the Humber. Then we see them crossing the channel that divides England from the Continent of Europe, penetrating into France and Burgundy, ascending the Rhine, passing into Switzerland, and finally descending the Alps, entering Italy, establishing themselves on the Apennines, and reaching as far south as the Straits of Messina. Carrying with them everywhere the Catholic faith and monastic life, converting tribes and nations from that paganism into which the greater part of Europe had relapsed since the barbarian invasions. Wherever they went they left churches and monasteries in their track to mark their progress.

Seven famous churches and monastic institutions were founded in Caledonia, or Scotland, as it was afterwards called, by Irish missionary enterprise. Twelve were founded in England, seven in France, twelve in Armorica (or Brittany), seven in Lorraine, ten in Alsace, sixteen in Bavaria, fifteen in Rhetia, Helvetia, or Switzerland and Germany. One hundred and fifty Irish missionary saints died in Germany, and thirty-six of these died as martyrs. Forty-five died in Gaul, or France, six of whom were martyrs. In Belgium, thirty Irish saints who laboured there are still venerated. Thirteen Irish missionary saints laboured and founded churches and monasteries in Italy, where their feasts are still kept with becoming splendour; and eight Irish martyrs laid down their lives for the Faith in Norway and Iceland. Sanctity in Ireland during the fifth and sixth centuries, to use the expression of Dom Gougaud, 'became rapidly exuberant,' and drove out those who had themselves but lately received the faith, and made them in their turn apostles to carry it to other nations and peoples.

Another very striking characteristic, apparently common

to all these Celtic missionary saints, was their insatiable love for travelling. Gildas, the historian of the British Church, who lived before the time of St. Bede, has called attention to this trait of their character in these words: 'To voyage over seas, and to pace over broad tracts of land, was to them not so much a weariness as a delight.' Fuller, a voluminous Anglican divine of the seventeenth century, writes of them:—

Most of these men seem born under a travelling planet; seldom having their education in the place of their nativity, oftentimes composed of Irish infancy, British breeding, and French preferment; taking a cowl in one country, a crozier in another, and a grave in a third; neither bred where born, nor beneficed where bred, nor buried where beneficed; but wandering in several kingdoms.

The true secret motive, however, of this love of travel and this wandering instinct which characterizes in such a marked way these Irish missionary saints, has been well pointed out for us by that learned Celtic scholar, Dom Gougaud, of Farnborough Abbey, in his interesting pamphlet on *The Work of the Irish in Continental Europe*:—

For the most part monks, their voluntary exile from their country was looked upon by them as a supreme immolation, most eminently fitting to perfect the work of renunciation which they had undertaken. To quit one's country 'for the love of God,' 'for the Name of our Lord,' 'for the healing of one's soul,' 'in order to obtain our Heavenly country,' such are the formulas, varying in expression, but identical in meaning, which the biographers of these saintly travellers have chosen to denote the motives of their journeyings. It would seem as if they too had heard the voice which said to the Patriarch Abraham, 'Go out from thy country and thy kindred.'

Thus in these missionary saints the love of travel was identified with the apostolic spirit, and their journeyings, like the journeyings of St. Paul, were all part of their apostolic labours.

The training grounds in which these apostolic travellers were trained for their missionary enterprises were those vast monastic communities in which Ireland was more

prolific than any country in the world. It must never be forgotten that from the fifth to the eighth century one of the chief centres of Christianity in Europe, and also the principal home of knowledge, literature, and art, was in Ireland. Speaking of its monastic institutions in that golden age of Irish history, Montalembert says:—

In these vast monastic cities . . . were trained an entire population of philosophers, of writers, of architects, of carvers, of painters, of calligraphers, of musicians, poets, and historians ; but above all, of missionaries and preachers, destined to spread the light of the Gospel and Christian education not only in all the Celtic countries, of which Ireland was always the nursing mother, but throughout Europe, among all the Teutonic races, among the Franks and the Burgundians, who were already masters of Gaul, as well as amid the dwellers by the Rhine and Danube, and up to the frontiers of Italy. Thus sprung up also those armies of saints, who were more numerous, more national, more popular, and, it must be added more extraordinary, in Ireland than in any other Christian land. . . . They exercised a lively influence upon the Christian imagination during all the Middle Ages, and even up to the time of Christopher Columbus himself, to whom the salt-water epic of St. Brendan seems to have pointed out the way to America.¹

To follow, then, and briefly to trace out the missionary career of a few amongst these wonderful men may prove to be at once interesting and instructive. With that end in view, I propose on some future occasion to treat the missionary labours of St. Columba in Scotland and in the north of England, and those of St. Columbanus in France, Burgundy, Germany, Switzerland, and Italy. Later on, if occasion offers, I propose to trace out the missionary careers of St. Fursey and his companions from Lough Corrib in Galway to Lagny and Peronne in France, and of St. Cataldus from Lismore, on the banks of the Blackwater, to the Gulf of Taranto, in Southern Italy.

In concluding this introductory survey of the place filled in history by the labours of the early Celtic mission-

¹ *Monks of the West*, vol. ii. p. 430.

ary saints, it will be useful to bear in mind that besides being the apostles of many nations and peoples and the founders of churches throughout Europe during the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, they were also, at the beginning of the ninth century, the founders of the first universities of Christendom ; for we read that Charlemagne invited from Ireland two monks famous for their learning, named, respectively, Clement and John, the first of whom became the founder of the University of Paris, and the second the founder of the University of Pavia, thus kindling that bright light of learning and science destined ultimately to shine throughout the whole civilized world, to endure during the entire course of the Middle Ages, and to be the source from which the greatest minds of medieval Christendom were to receive that copious supply of illuminating wisdom and knowledge, represented by the writings of the schoolmen, and enshrined in the pages of Albertus Magnus, in the works of Duns Scotus, and in the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas.

W. H. KIRWAN.

THE PRAGMATIC VALUE OF THEISM

I.—THE THEISTIC HYPOTHESIS

WITH one exception, traditional proofs of the existence of God start from the data of human experience, and argue back to its presupposition, ground, or cause ; and with this exception—for the Ontological argument, even in its Leibnitzian form, is generally held to be fallacious—by most philosophers previous to the eighteenth century these proofs were regarded as valid. Agnosticism and Scepticism were never really dangerous till Kant came with his Transcendental Method, and declared—translating the analogy of *ens* into terms of his own philosophy—that to predicate ‘causality’ of God is to apply a category beyond the sphere in which its application is legitimate, i.e., beyond the sphere of human experience in which alone human concepts and human forms of synthesis are valid. Nowadays, however, probably the majority of non-scholastic philosophers are of opinion that God’s existence cannot be proved in the old-fashioned way.

As to where precisely the flaw in our arguments lies our opponents are not agreed. On the side of Absolutism, Professor Taylor urges that all imply the Ontological Argument,¹ while on the Pragmatic side Dr. Schiller, though preferring God to the Absolute, declares that the arguments by which man has hitherto sought to prove His existence are too abstract and too general, that they apply to any world quite as much as to our own, and hence give us a God who is indifferent to man and to mundane affairs.² Thus, though all do not go so far as Dr. Mellone, who bluntly tells us that ‘we can never again try to pass from Nature up to Nature’s God,’³ dissatisfaction with the traditional arguments of Natural Theology is fairly widespread.

¹ *Elements of Metaphysics*, b. iv. c. 5, § 9.

² *Humanism*, p. 82.

³ *Essays in Philosophical Criticism and Construction*, p. 25.

What, then, are we to do? It is clearly of little use to go on repeating *ad nauseam* arguments which, though doubtless valid in themselves, are obvious to few besides ourselves and the angels. Yet, on the other hand, we have the explicit declaration of the Vatican Council¹ to the effect that the existence of God can be proved by the light of natural reason from the universe of finite beings in which we live. May it not be well, then, for purposes of Apologetic, to try whether a different way of stating our arguments may not be more successful? It is possible that the obstacles which so many encounter in attempting to pass from Nature up to Nature's God, and find insurmountable, in reality face only one way. Hence, if we start at the other end, and, taking the existence of God as our hypothesis, proceed to verify it by showing that its consequences harmonise with the facts of human experience and satisfy the demands of human nature, it may be that the passage which, at the bottom of our hearts, we all desire to traverse will be fraught with fewer difficulties. At any rate, as I suggested in my last article, it is worth while to make the attempt.

How, then, are we to formulate our hypothesis? *Existit ens necessarium?* Such a statement is far too abstract to appeal to anyone nowadays, unless it be to the scholastic or to the intellectualist; and God, as so conceived, is certainly very different from the God of religious worship and religious ideals. Let us be a little more explicit, therefore, and a little more concrete. As Christians, to whom do we pray, and in whom do we believe? We believe, say the Fathers of the Vatican Council, that

there is one true and living God, Creator and Lord of heaven and earth, omnipotent, eternal, immense, incomprehensible, infinite in intelligence, will, and in every perfection; Who, since He is a unique, wholly simple and unchangeable spiritual substance, must be acknowledged to be really and essentially distinct from the world, most blessed in Himself and in His creatures, and inexpressibly exalted above all things which are or which can be conceived beside him.²

¹ De Revelatione, cap. 2. and can. 1. Denziger, *Enchiridion Symb. et Defn.* 10th edition, 1908. n. 1785, 1806.

² Sess. III. cap. i. (D 1782.)

In this short statement of the nature of the God in whom all Christians believe, we may distinguish two elements, one positive the other negative. The positive element may be expressed in three propositions, which together contain the sum and substance of all the knowledge that we can obtain of God by the light of natural reason. First, God *is*, simply and absolutely. Secondly, God is all-perfect. Thirdly, whatever exists besides God is wholly dependent upon Him for all that it is and has and does. The negative element comprises what are known in Natural Theology as the attributes of God ; for these attributes, though they each of them imply that God is the All-perfect Being, are primarily negative in that their chief function is to remove from our idea of God those limitations which are inevitably involved in our human concepts of being and perfection.

God *is*—simply and absolutely. To ask why God is, or how He comes to be, is really to ask an unanswerable, because an irrational, question ; the whole fact of the matter being that God is, and that He is what He is. Not that God is an empty abstraction such as the terms ‘is’ and ‘being’ may possibly suggest. On the contrary, God is ‘being’ in the fullest conceivable sense. He is *ens plenissimum*, and every perfection that is to be found in this world of ours, every perfection that is possible or can in any way be conceived, is there in God, fully realized in the plenitude of His Divine nature. Goodness, beauty, happiness, power, intelligence, knowledge, will, all these God possesses in the unity of a single all-embracing experience. God’s life is life itself, experience itself, happiness itself ; and from the omnipotent and all-perfect character of this life it follows that God is *imitabilis ad extra* in an infinity of ways.

One of these ways God has chosen to make actual, and thus by an act of His Divine will there exists a universe in which His perfections are to some extent reproduced. This universe consists of finite individual beings, interacting, interconnected, interrelated one with another, yet each having its own existence and its own nature, an existence and a nature that is not identical with God’s. But the

existence and nature of these created beings is not their own in the same full sense that God's nature is His. Created beings are essentially dependent beings,¹ depending throughout the whole course of their existence for every perfection that they possess and for every act that they are able to perform; dependent also for their very existence itself. Nevertheless, these finite, dependent beings, precisely because they are dependent and owe their existence to an Other, reproduce in varying degrees,² but always imperfectly, the nature of Him from whom they proceed. Every perfection that exists in this universe of ours is in a finite way a reproduction and a manifestation of the infinite perfection of God.

Now man, who ranks among the higher orders of these finite dependent beings, has immediate cognizance of their existence and to some extent of their nature, but of God he has no immediate cognizance. Revelation apart—his knowledge of God is derived, not directly from God Himself, but indirectly from the creatures in whom His infinite perfection is finitely manifested. The perfections which man finds around him and within him he refers back to their ultimate source, to God their Creator; and thus arises in his mind the idea of an All-perfect Being.

But the perfections of which man has experience here below are one and all fraught with limitation. Whence two consequences: (1) that these perfections can be predicated of God only by way of analogy, and (2) that in predicating them we must make certain restrictions whereby to get rid as far as possible of those limitations which finite perfections invariably suggest. No perfection is predicable of God in precisely the same sense that it is predicable of one of His creatures, and no finite perfection is predicable of Him at all except *per modum remotionis*. Hence the negative element which is so prominent in any human statement of the Divine nature. In order to avoid all danger of misconception, theologians predicate of God certain 'attributes' which at once deny the limitations that are

¹ D. 1789.

² D. 504.

characteristic of our finite experience, and at the same time reaffirm in some one or other of its many aspects the infinite perfection of The All-perfect Being.

Thus we say that God is infinite, and in so doing our first intention is to deny that there can be to His nature any limit or bound or deficiency. Infinite means not-finite, so that in form our predicate is negative. But in reality it is things finite that are negative. To be finite is to have an end, to be limited ; which means to say (1) that there are other things outside that which is thus finite, and (2) that these other things are independent of it so far as their existence and essential nature is concerned. By 'independent' I do not, of course, mean isolated. Things do not exist in isolation ; but are all interconnected, inter-related and to some extent interdependent in regard to what they are able to do and to become. No finite thing is altogether or absolutely independent ; but it is independent of other finite things in that it is not continually receiving or deriving either its existence or its nature from them. Finitude of necessity implies an Other which has its own nature and its own existence independently of this finite thing. My thoughts, my volitions, my actions, as such, do not make me finite, for they are immanent within me, proceed from, and are dependent upon, me. Hence that God should think and act and will does not mean that He is finite. My human thoughts and my human actions limit me and make me finite, not because they are thoughts and actions (unless indeed the emphasis be laid here upon the plural), but because they are human. For human thoughts and human actions in a two-fold way imply an Other : first, in that the concepts by which man thinks, the actions which he performs, and the purposes which he seeks to realize are ever changing, ever capable of further development, and thus imply an Other which as yet they have not attained ; and secondly, because they are to a large extent determined *ab extra*, by something else, by environment, by the books we read and the people with whom we converse.

When we say, then, that God is infinite, we deny that the predicate 'finite' is in any way applicable to Him, i.e.,

we deny that there is any Other which is at once outside of Him and yet independent of Him. There may be other things besides God, whose existence is not His existence, nor their nature His nature ; but, if so, both the nature and the existence of these finite beings depend wholly upon God and are conferred, as it were, by His perpetual deed of gift, so that in no way do they limit Him, but on the contrary manifest His perfections *ad extra*.

In the real order, therefore, it is the Infinite which is prior and positive, the finite which is posterior and negative ; and infinitude in this positive sense means the possession of every perfection *tota simul*—altogether, while finitude is a negation in some wise of these perfections. But in the order in which our concepts are developed the finite is prior to the infinite. Hence for us and from our human point of view infinity is the negation of finitude ; and is, so to speak, a double negative, since it denies that which is itself negative, and so brings us back to that absolute Being who embraces every perfection in the unity of His self-existent nature. As in other cases, so here, our conception of God's attributes is largely relative, so much so, in fact, that there would be no sense in predicating Infinity of God were it not that natural knowledge of Him is derived solely from a world of finite existence in which His perfections are more or less manifest. Did we know God as He is in Himself, there would be no further need of these quasi-negative attributes. But we do not. We know Him only in relation to our finite world, and hence can describe His nature only *per analogiam et per modum remotionis*.

To our human reason God is incomprehensible, as He must be if He is infinite and we are finite. A nature infinitely perfect cannot be fully grasped and understood by a finite human mind. At best it will be but dimly thought and vaguely appreciated. Yet it is possible to exaggerate the incomprehensibility of God's nature, as Plato and Aristotle and philosophers of the Gnostic and Alexandrian schools were wont to do. We must not emphasize God's incomprehensibility to such an extent that He becomes for us a far-off Being, unknowable and unintelligible, shut off

from this finite world by an insuperable barrier, out of touch with our human affairs, and having no further concern with His creatures once they are created.

This is a wholly false view of God, as we shall see when we come to treat of His relations to His creatures, and particularly of His relations to man. The attributes we predicate of God may be anthropomorphic in origin, and hence apply to Him only by way of analogy, and the conception which we are able to form of Him may be in this sense largely symbolic; but our analogous predicates are not wholly inapplicable or altogether inappropriate, nor are our concepts so symbolic that they in no way and in no degree reveal the nature of Him to whom they are applied. It is true that while on earth we see as through a glass but darkly. Yet we see. All that we mean when we say that God is incomprehensible is, that we cannot know Him fully, cannot understand Him completely as He is, cannot entirely grasp or comprehend the infinite perfection of His nature. How far, and in what way precisely, our finite human concepts apply to this Infinite Being we cannot tell, because we can never entirely get rid of the imperfections which arise from our human modes of thought; but in so far as we can get rid of, or allow for, these imperfections, our concepts are valid, and to this extent God's nature is truly expressed in the perfections which we predicate of Him, for these perfections, as we first know them in their finite form, are perfections that God has created, and hence truly and really manifest the nature of Him who creates.

From the fact that God is infinite, therefore, it follows that His nature is incomprehensible in the literal sense of that term, though not unknowable by us; and it also follows, as we have already seen, that His nature is one.

Unity, like Infinity, is an attribute which in its primary significance is negative. By it we deny that God can be classified under any genus, or that any other being is like to Him in all respects. By it we repudiate Polytheism, and affirm that our God is the only God, the only absolute Existent. But, again, as in the case of Infinity, the need of predicating Unity of God is due to the finite character of

our human way of thinking. Were it not that our conception of God is so imperfect, the very idea of His nature being capable of multiplication would never occur to us ; and could we but for a single moment behold God as He really is, we should realize at once that to talk of there being more than one God is to talk of something utterly impossible and absurd.

Polytheism, indeed, is a sheer blunder, due to the fact that one tribe or nation has conceived God as embodying some one finite perfection, another another, and that then there came a third tribe or nation which, seeing here not one god viewed under different aspects, but two different gods, decided to worship these foreign gods together with its own. Thus grew up the hierarchy of Greek and Roman divinities. Wherefore both Jew and Christian, by way of protest against such a misconception of God's nature, are compelled to affirm that God is one.

The Unity of God, therefore, is primarily the negation of Polytheism : but if ever we see God face to face, the utility of this attribute in this, its primary and negative significance, will practically cease. We shall realize that to affirm that God is One is only another way of saying that God is.

There are, however, degrees of unity as there are degrees of reality and perfection. The concept of unity implies for us the coherence of parts or differences in a systematic or organic whole, a coherence which may be more or less perfect and complete. Thus the parts of a clock can be separated from the whole without losing their identity. So, too, the parts of a worm or hydra, without the loss of life ; whereas in the higher animals an amputated member sooner or later is certain to die. Again, there are wholes of which the parts or integrating elements, though never found in isolation, are yet really different or ' distinct.' Thus in nature one never finds a substance without some quality or determination ; yet, on the other hand, qualities and accidents are distinct from substances in that the same substance may have at one time one quality, at another time another. Colour, size, figure, shape, feeling, perception,

thought, motion, action, volition, are all liable to change, while the substance to which they belong and of which they are determinations or accidents, remains throughout the same. Even in the psychical order, though thought never occurs without sensation nor without some form of purposive volition, yet in successive phases of human experience sometimes thought predominates, sometimes sensation, sometimes feeling or emotion, sometimes conative impulse or will. Our human faculties are one in that they are but diverse expressions of one and the self-same Ego, but inasmuch as each has its own distinctive character and function in the economy of the whole, and again in that the activity of one does not by any means imply a like activity on the part of the others, they are many.

Lastly, in a finite being essence and existence may in some sense be said to be distinct, for we can conceive of things (i.e., of the essences of things) which do not exist, and for that matter may never exist as such. And though in the concrete there is no essence without existence, nor existence without essence, the fact that many finite things are possible yet do not exist, that none are such that they must of necessity exist, and none such that they may not under certain conditions cease to exist, justifies us in asserting that for finite contingent beings 'to exist' and 'to have an essence,' though inseparable in the concrete, are not at all the same thing. Essence is to existence as potentiality is to act, and what is only *in potentia*, i.e., a mere possibility, either concrete or abstract, is clearly something different from, and less than, the realized actuality.

All these distinctions, therefore, imply imperfection or want of coherence in the entity of which they are predicable. Parts which are separable may be taken away. Faculties which are distinct may cease to be active. Essences which were once potential may become potential again. In proportion, therefore, as distinctions are more marked and parts more easily separated, so much the more do they imply imperfection and so much the less are they predicable of God. In God, who is all-perfect, there are no parts; in the unity of His nature no ground for real distinction. God is

a substance in that His existence is His own. He is not of another as is a quality. But God's substance is not further determined by any qualities or accidents superadded and separable. In Him thought, will, feeling, emotion, activity exist *eminenter*, in a higher form, a higher unity, a higher synthesis, if you like, in which there is no real distinction of part from part, or faculty from faculty, or essence from existence. Each of God's attributes implies, connotes, and *is* the whole. His essence is His existence, for He is simply and absolutely; and in the Absolute, as the Hegelians rightly say, essence and existence are inseparably one.

The negation of all distinctions in God's nature is summed up in the attribute Simplicity. God is simple. In Him there is no composition. But since, as distinction passes into separability, the more repugnant does it become to the nature of God, while, on the other hand, in the higher forms of life, in rational souls and in spirits, separability and all crude distinction vanishes, we also affirm that God is spiritual, that He is intelligence and will without body. To have a body is to be extended, to have parts outside parts, each with its own proper function in the idea of the whole, yet physically separable therefrom; and a composite whole which is thus made up of separable parts is clearly less perfect than one in which the parts or functions, though distinct and to some extent independent, are not separable. Corporeity, therefore, or the possession of body, comprising organized though separable parts, connoting as it does the possibility of disintegration, decomposition and decay, is wholly incompatible with the all-perfect nature of the Deity.

Thus, though we have hitherto considered God from a static point of view, the possibility of change is already implicitly denied in the attribute of Simplicity. God cannot be subject to any kind of mutation or disintegration, for in Him there is nothing that can change or decay. If God changes at all He must change altogether; but since it is His very nature to *be*, and since the whole essence of Him who *is*, is from the very outset and always fully and completely realized, this is impossible. Change of any kind

whatsoever is repugnant to the very idea of God. God is the absolute Being, and hence is absolutely immutable. In Him there is no potentiality, but every perfection of His nature is fully realized in one simple and absolute act.

Regarded from a somewhat different point of view, this absolute character of God's existence is expressed in another attribute—Eternity. As our life is finite in that it is essentially a process of change, so also is it finite in that it had a beginning, and in its present corporeal form will have an end. A two-fold finitude, then, has to be removed from the concept of 'life,' when that concept is applied to God. Hence while the attribute of Immutability denies that God's life is a process, the attribute of Eternity denies that it has either beginning or end. Both attributes are negative; yet both are also positive in that they imply and re-affirm the absolute and all-perfect character of God's life. Though God never changes, but is and always has been and always will be eternally the same, yet He really lives. His activity is a real activity, though it is activity without process or movement—*ἐνέργεια ἀκινήσις*; and the perfections, the ideals, if you like, which this activity realizes, are truly realized, though they are not realized piecemeal as are ours, but by the very act in which they are conceived. Eternity, in fact, as Boethius put it long ago, is precisely this possession of a life that is perfect and *tota simul*.

God's life, being absolute, transcends the limits of time, and for a similar reason it transcends the limits of space. Within the finite span of our human consciousness we know immediately only that which is 'just coming' or 'just fading away,' but God, who is eternal, knows all things together in one act. In like manner our consciousness, conditioned as it is by motions of a physical character within our finite human body, has immediate cognizance only of that which directly affects the senses: only things in our immediate neighbourhood are present to us and we to them. But to God, who is not confined within a body, all things are present, they to Him and He to them by His power, His knowledge, and His being. We say that a

thing is where it acts, for if a thing does not act upon us directly or at any rate upon something connected with us, so far as we are concerned it might as well not be at all. And in this sense God *is* everywhere, creating and sustaining all things by His infinite power, co-operating or concurring in every act which they perform. But to God's act there is, strictly speaking, no reaction on the part of the creature, or at least no reaction in which God does not co-operate and concur. God knows all things, but He does not depend upon His creatures for that knowledge. He knows what He creates in the very act by which He creates it.

God, then, is everywhere, and hence is said to be 'im-mense,' a term which sounds inappropriate to our modern minds, because it suggests that God is very big, and thus seems to introduce into our concept of Him that very idea of spatial extension which we have been so careful to exclude. Immensity, however, as a technical term in Natural Theology, does not connote either extension or corporeity, though it does connote whatever perfection corporeity implies, and this it re-affirms of God without limit or bound. But the positive value of having a body is nothing more than the possibility of that mutual presence in regard to other things of which we have spoken above, and this perfection God has in His own way, since, as we said, all things are present to Him and He to them. Without the organs of sense God has experience and knowledge of all that is, and without having parts or the movements of parts, is present to all things, continuously creating them, as it were, by a single act of His will. While, therefore, under the attribute of Eternity we conceive God as transcending time and yet as possessing *eminenter* all the perfections that existence in time connotes, *scil.* consciousness and life, under the attribute of Immensity we conceive God as transcending space and yet as embracing all that existence in space implies, *scil.*, experience, knowledge, and power, all of which God has *eminenter*, and absolutely without limit or measure or bound.

Here we may close the list of these so-called attributes of God. They are attributes in the sense that one and all

may with truth be attributed to, or predicated of, God ; but they are not attributes in the same sense that intelligence, power, will, beauty and goodness are attributes of God. For while the latter are positive perfections which signify different aspects of God's all-perfect nature, the attributes we have just been considering are essentially negative in function. Consequently, even apart from the negation of the simplicity of God which such a view would imply, they can in no way be regarded as qualities inhering in God. They are nothing of the kind. They do not even signify different perfections, but rather the negation of imperfection. Thus Infinity is the negation of finitude, Unity of plurality, Simplicity of composition, Immutability of change, Eternity and Immensity of existence in space and time. But inasmuch as it is the finite, the many, the composite, the changeful, the temporal, and the extended that are really negative (since each implies limitation and deficiency), to affirm that God is one, infinite, simple, immutable, eternal, immense is in truth to reassert in diverse ways the self-same truth that God has and is every conceivable and every possible perfection in an absolutely perfect way.

Thus our discussion of God's attributes has brought us back almost to our starting-point, and has incidentally confirmed our original statement that the positive element in our belief in God consists in the knowledge that He *is*, and that He is all-perfect. All we have done so far is to purge our concept of imperfections due to our human point of view. We have yet to discuss the third element in our knowledge of God, to consider Him as the Creator of the universe.

Two radically different points of view are possible in dealing with the problem of creation. We may, if we choose, take up an essentially anthropomorphic attitude, and regard the world as a process of becoming in time, parallel with which runs the eternal and immutable existence of God ; in which case our description of this process will be somewhat as follows : First of all we shall picture to ourselves God existing alone for endless ages before the world

began ; then the sudden calling into being of what previously had no existence at all ; after that no more creation except where human souls are required to inform a human body, only Divine conservation of what already exists and Divine concurrence in all acts that are productive of change, or, in other words, God as Father and Lord watching over, guiding, and governing the growth and development of the beings He has called into existence with infinite foresight, wisdom, mercy, and love.

Or we may try to look at things, as far as may be, from an absolute standpoint. In which case we shall consider God not as existing, so to speak, in a plane parallel to our own, but as the centre of an all-embracing experience, complete and wholly perfect in itself, absolutely identical with itself, including within itself all possible worlds in which the Divine perfections could be manifested ; and before this experience as a term-one of these possible worlds, produced by the free, though eternal act of this absolute Being, and consisting of a system of individuals essentially finite and wholly dependent both for their nature and existence upon the beneficent will of Him who eternally creates them.

The first view is the more common precisely because of its anthropomorphic character ; and for the same reason is fraught with almost insuperable difficulties. So anthropomorphic is it, indeed, that it seems to represent God as little more than a glorified human being, endowed with essentially human perfections, and as changeful in His manner of action as are the finite beings He creates. Accordingly, I shall adopt the second alternative.

Conceive, then, on the one hand, God, all-perfect, infinite, self-subsistent, embracing within Himself all knowledge, all truth, all wisdom, all power, having no need nor want nor desire that is not completely fulfilled ; yet because of His infinite perfections *imitabilis ad extra* in an infinity of ways ; and, on the other hand, a world of finite beings of various kinds ; some more perfect, some less perfect ; some corporeal, some sensitive, some rational, some pure spirits ; some co-existent, but with others successive, or

divided by an interval of time; yet all of them real, each in its own degree, and all of them interrelated and bound up together in a single plan or design. This world God creates, and creates by a single and undivided act.

Conservation and concurrence are but different aspects of this act. In essence it is one: diverse only in its effects. To persevere in existence is something more than merely to exist, and change or the production of fresh quality or substance by what already exists, is something further still. And all of this, too, implies activity on God's part as well as on the part of the creature, but whereas the creature's activity is diverse and in time, God's activity is one and eternal. God does not by one act create the universe, then cease creating altogether, and by another act, different in nature, preserve—or conserve—what already exists, and by yet another co-operate in the production of what is new. To speak thus is to introduce a time-relation into the being of God, to insinuate that His acts are successive. We assert the same truth, but more accurately, if we say that, while the act of creation itself is eternal, by it is allotted to each created being a certain span of existence, contemporaneous with or in succession to that of other beings, and by it upon each conferred the potentiality of further development, the realization of which takes place in time and is conditioned not only by God's eternal act but also by the activity of other beings, which thus depend both upon God and upon one another. Thus it will be clearly seen that time is a relation which holds only *within* the created universe, and has nothing to do with the relation of creature to Creator. God did not create the universe *in* time, but rather *with* time.¹ It is only our finite activities that operate *in* time. Hence creation does not mean the production of being out of a *pre*-existent nothing by a *pre*-existing God. It simply means that the universe exists solely because it is the term or product of an eternal act of Divine omnipotence, and consequently that every being within that universe, though

¹ D. 1783.

really distinct from God—*distinctus re et essentia*, is none the less dependent upon Him for all that it is and has and does. The reason why God creates the universe may be stated briefly in the words of the Decree of the Vatican Council from which we have already quoted above. He creates it 'out of His goodness and by His omnipotent power, not in order to increase His own beatitude, nor yet to add to His perfection, but rather to manifest that perfection through the good which He imparts to creatures.' Goodness and love of their very nature are *diffusivum sui*. Hence although God Himself, being infinitely good, is self-sufficient, and by the very act by which He knows Himself at the same time loves Himself with an infinite love, yet His love and His goodness tend to manifest themselves *ad extra*. Hence the possibility of a real world, distinct from God, yet dependent upon Him and being of its very nature a manifestation of Himself. Infinitely perfect, and for that reason infinitely happy *in se et ex se*, God has no need of creatures. He is constrained to create neither by the want of something upon which to bestow His love, nor yet by the contemplated beauty and perfection of an intended creation, nor yet again because otherwise there would be a deficiency in His nature. His creative act is perfectly free. Contemplating within Himself innumerable ways and innumerable worlds in which His perfections might be manifested, He chooses one. Not because He has need of it, nor yet because it is better or worse than any other world, but purely of His own free choice He wills that this world and not any other shall exist. The possibility of a created world follows necessarily from God's all-perfect nature, so too does the motive or purpose of creation. But this motive, though a *sufficient* motive for creating, does not compel God to create. He creates of His own free will. Of His own free will He chooses that His perfections shall be manifested *ad extra* to rational creatures who, recognizing the image of God their Creator, may glorify Him and love Him in return for the love which He eternally bestows upon them.

This, then, is our hypothesis: God is, and is all-perfect. He is therefore one, infinite, incomprehensible, simple,

of steadfast sanctity which would attract sympathy and inspire reverence. There were then no elaborate processes canonization, with minute researches, and arguments for or against the fitness of granting a saintly title; the most learned and the most simple believer could equally and easily realize the grandeur of the victory of conscience over the brutal violence of the persecutor. The prayers of a living Christian could benefit his brethren. Was it possible that the martyr had lost his power of intercession when his soul had left his tormented body? The scene resembled Calvary too closely to be profitless to the struggling Church on earth. In vain Tertullian protested in the bitter days of his Montanism: 'Let it be enough for the martyr to have bought forgiveness for his own crimes. Who has paid the price of another's death by his own, except only the Son of God?'¹ Heedless of the reproaches of this Primitive Methodist, the Christian instinct continued to recognize in martyrdom an image of the Sacred Passion of our Lord.

It was after the peace of Constantine, and during the fourth and fifth centuries, that the veneration of the saints reached its full development. In that period of great doctors and bishops—of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, the two Gregories, St. John Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Jerome—testimony is so abundant that the difficulty lies in making a choice. It is expedient, however, to have before our minds the state of the Christian practice in these centuries that we may trace the practices back into the more obscure period which precedes them. It is the later and more clearly manifested instinct of this second period which gives meaning to the scattered evidence of the same instinct in the earlier age.

The Edict of Milan, which Constantine, with his colleague Licinius, published after his victory over Maxentius, opened a new era for the Christian religion different altogether in character from that which had witnessed its early struggle for life. The religion of

¹ *De Judicitia*, xxii.

the Cross had, it is true, enjoyed its periods of peace; still its safety, even in its most secure times, had been precarious. The change of a ruler, or even of a ruler's whim, might at any time plunge the Christian communities into the horrors of persecution. The Edict of Milan did not merely call a truce, or make a temporary arrangement between the Church and the empire; it published a new principle of toleration, and proclaimed a fundamental change in the relations between the Roman State and the Christian religion. 'Liberty of worship,' runs the edict, 'cannot be produced by constraint; let each man be allowed, in divine things, to obey the dictate of his conscience.' Then, after clauses granting liberty to the Christians, the document goes on: 'What we accord to them, we accord to all; all shall enjoy the freedom to choose and practise whatever worship they prefer, as it is fitting to the peace of our rule that no one shall be injured in his honour or in his worship.' Immediately there began to be manifested a zeal for the Christian religion, resulting in hosts of conversions, in added pomp of worship, in vigorous missionary enterprise, in religious art and architecture.

A well-informed contemporary describes the sudden revival enthusiastically—the miraculous recovery of the empire from its old disease, temples rising to the heavens more gorgeous than any that had been seen before, generous donations from the pious emperor, splendid celebrations of dedication-festivals.¹

In this hour of victory the heroes of the ancient battles were not forgotten. The tombs of the martyrs became centres of devotion. Basilicas rose to mark their resting place, or memorial churches (martyria) sheltered their sacred remains. In Rome, where the burial place of the saints had been marked by 'trophies,' doubtless some modest memorials, basilicas were now built—St. Peter's in the Vatican cemetery, St. Paul's on the Ostian Way; St. Laurence had his church in Agro Verano, and

¹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. x. chaps. ii. and iii.

immutable, eternal, and immense. He is also our Creator, Father, and Lord. Out of sheer goodness and by His omnipotent will He creates the universe in which we live, creates it freely, and in the very act by which He creates it, knows it and loves it really and truly because in it are manifested really and truly, though in a finite way, His own infinite perfections. This hypothesis we propose to verify in a later article according to the Pragmatic Method, of which we have already given some account.

LESLIE J. WALKER, S.J.

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH—II

THIS article forms the continuation and conclusion of one that appeared in the January number of this Review. The special point to be treated is the primitive doctrine and practice of the veneration of the saints. As a matter of fact our enquiry will be confined almost entirely to the subject of the cult of the martyrs, for it was these that the first generations of Christians marked out as the close followers of the heroic sanctity of Christ. Assembled round their tombs, the faithful realized the nobility of their sacrifice, the intimacy of the martyrs with their Master, in whose honour they had made the supreme renunciation. The martyrs had fulfilled the greatest of the Christian counsels, they had given the testimony of most perfect love, they had lost life in order that they might find it. In their tortured frames Christ had once more suffered. The writer of the letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne expresses this thought in his description of the martyrdom of Sanctus, the deacon:—

Terribly maimed, he no longer presented the shape of a man. But Christ Himself was in the heart of the martyr and bore his tortures, worked marvellous things, overthrew the ancient enemy, and showed the others, by a bright example, that there is no room for fear where one finds the charity of the heavenly Father: there is no suffering where suffering gives place to the glory of Christ.¹

We can readily understand that in the ages of persecution, when the tragic spectacle of martyrdom was displayed in every part of the empire, the martyr should be the type

¹ Acts of the Martyrs of Lyons. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. v. chap. i.-iv. There are other passages in these Acts which render the same idea of the likeness of the martyrs to Christ. The attitude of Blandina, fastened to a post, recalls that of Christ crucified; the frail body of this slave is 'clothed in the victorious strength of Christ.'

of steadfast sanctity which would attract sympathy and inspire reverence. There were then no elaborate processes canonization, with minute researches, and arguments for or against the fitness of granting a saintly title; the most learned and the most simple believer could equally and easily realize the grandeur of the victory of conscience over the brutal violence of the persecutor. The prayers of a living Christian could benefit his brethren. Was it possible that the martyr had lost his power of intercession when his soul had left his tormented body? The scene resembled Calvary too closely to be profitless to the struggling Church on earth. In vain Tertullian protested in the bitter days of his Montanism: 'Let it be enough for the martyr to have bought forgiveness for his own crimes. Who has paid the price of another's death by his own, except only the Son of God?'¹ Heedless of the reproaches of this Primitive Methodist, the Christian instinct continued to recognize in martyrdom an image of the Sacred Passion of our Lord.

It was after the peace of Constantine, and during the fourth and fifth centuries, that the veneration of the saints reached its full development. In that period of great doctors and bishops—of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, the two Gregories, St. John Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Jerome—testimony is so abundant that the difficulty lies in making a choice. It is expedient, however, to have before our minds the state of the Christian practice in these centuries that we may trace the practices back into the more obscure period which precedes them. It is the later and more clearly manifested instinct of this second period which gives meaning to the scattered evidence of the same instinct in the earlier age.

The Edict of Milan, which Constantine, with his colleague Licinius, published after his victory over Maxentius, opened a new era for the Christian religion different altogether in character from that which had witnessed its early struggle for life. The religion of

¹ *De Judicitiis*, xxii.

the Cross had, it is true, enjoyed its periods of peace; still its safety, even in its most secure times, had been precarious. The change of a ruler, or even of a ruler's whim, might at any time plunge the Christian communities into the horrors of persecution. The Edict of Milan did not merely call a truce, or make a temporary arrangement between the Church and the empire; it published a new principle of toleration, and proclaimed a fundamental change in the relations between the Roman State and the Christian religion. 'Liberty of worship,' runs the edict, 'cannot be produced by constraint; let each man be allowed, in divine things, to obey the dictate of his conscience.' Then, after clauses granting liberty to the Christians, the document goes on: 'What we accord to them, we accord to all; all shall enjoy the freedom to choose and practise whatever worship they prefer, as it is fitting to the peace of our rule that no one shall be injured in his honour or in his worship.' Immediately there began to be manifested a zeal for the Christian religion, resulting in hosts of conversions, in added pomp of worship, in vigorous missionary enterprise, in religious art and architecture.

A well-informed contemporary describes the sudden revival enthusiastically—the miraculous recovery of the empire from its old disease, temples rising to the heavens more gorgeous than any that had been seen before, generous donations from the pious emperor, splendid celebrations of dedication-festivals.¹

In this hour of victory the heroes of the ancient battles were not forgotten. The tombs of the martyrs became centres of devotion. Basilicas rose to mark their resting place, or memorial churches (martyria) sheltered their sacred remains. In Rome, where the burial place of the saints had been marked by 'trophies,' doubtless some modest memorials, basilicas were now built—St. Peter's in the Vatican cemetery, St. Paul's on the Ostian Way; St. Laurence had his church in Agro Verano, and

¹ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. x. chaps. ii. and iii.

St. Agnes on the Via Nomentana. Devotion attracted crowds of pilgrims to other tombs—to that of St. John at Ephesus, of St. Polycarp at Smyrna, of St. Philip at Hierapolis, of St. Andrew at Patras.¹

In the year 366 Pope Damasus was elected. He threw all the weight of his influence as the first Bishop of Christendom into the propaganda of the cultus of the saints. He sought out and made glorious the burial places of the Roman martyrs. He facilitated access to their crypts in the catacombs, and preserved for all time the tradition of their sacred sites, which might soon have been effaced.

St. Jerome and Prudentius tell of the devotion that surrounded these shrines.² The Spanish poet leaves us a description of a Roman pilgrimage of which he was an eye-witness :—

Early in the morning they come with their salutations : all the youth of the region worship there ; they are coming and going till the setting of the sun. Love of religion collects Latins and strangers into one dense crowd. They imprint kisses on the shining silver ; they pour out fragrant balsams, their faces are moist with tears. . . The imperial city vomits forth her stream of Romans, and the populace, animated by the same desire, elbows its patrician neighbours as faith drives them forward to the shrine. The gates of Albano send forth its white-robed crowd in a long column. There is noise on all the roads. The native of Abruzzi and the Etruscan peasant come, the warlike Samnite, the countrymen of Capua the lofty and of Nola are there, each delights to take the road with his wife and children. The broad fields scarcely suffice to contain the joyful crowd, even where the space is wide, the crowd is so great as to cause delay.³

Here is a living picture of a pilgrim crowd on the way to a festa at San Lorenzo. St. Paulinus of Nola shows a similar scene in his adopted city on the 14th of January, the festival day of his patron, St. Felix. Nola is full to

¹ The cultus of the martyrs included that of the Apostles.

² St. Jerome, Ep. cvii. ad Laetum.

³ Prudentius, *Peristephanon*, xi.

overflowing with the crowds which pour into the town on the vigil of the feast. They keep watch during the night, not with prayer and fasting, but with feasting and merriment. The pious Bishop is no puritan; these boisterous pilgrims have come a long way—some from the most southerly provinces of Italy, others from Rome.¹ All will join in the festival on the morrow, when the basilica will be brilliant with lights, and draped with silken curtains, in honour of the saint whose fame has brought him from the luxury of his wealthy home on the banks of the Garonne.²

The association of the relics of the martyrs with the Holy Sacrifice was a powerful incentive towards devotion to the saints. The Roman custom of building the altar above the martyr's tomb became general. The founders of churches longed to place the relics of a saint beneath the altar. 'The martyr of Christ,' writes St. Ambrose, 'is the treasure of his church.'³ His presence, represented by his relics, connected his cultus with that of his Master and Model offered in sacrifice.

Illa sacramenti donatrix mensa, eademque
Custos fida sui martyris apposita.⁴

The desire of the Milanese and their Bishop, St. Ambrose, rewarded by the discovery of the bodies of SS. Gervaise and Protaise, is recorded both by St. Ambrose and by his illustrious convert, St. Augustine. In his discourse to the people on that event, St. Ambrose explains the symbolism of this custom—Christ, the Redeemer of all men, has the altar as His throne, while underneath are

¹ 'Ignoscenda tamen puto talia parvis

Gaudia quae ducunt epulis.'—Paulini Natal, ix. 563.

² In other places these popular pilgrimages became a veritable scandal. St. Martin discovered that his people were honouring a robber's tomb under the impression that martyrs were buried there (Sulp. Severus, *Vita S. Martini*, ii.). St. Augustine (Ep. xii.) complains of boisterous conduct—and worse—round the tombs of the saints. He tells us also that St. Ambrose ordered the agape at the tombs of the saints to be discontinued, as savouring of the parentalia of the pagans (conf., lib. vi. cap. 2). For St. Augustine's doctrine concerning this matter see *Contra Faustum*, xx.

³ *De Virginitate*, xv.

⁴ Prudentius, *Peristephanon*, xi.

placed the saints whom He has redeemed.¹ The Roman Canon of the Mass, with its commemoration of the saints, reveals the antiquity of the liturgical veneration of the apostles and martyrs. As was natural, the theological principle of its legitimacy being recognized, other saints, who were not martyrs, received the homage of an official cultus. St. Martin, St. Anthony, St. Hilarion and other ascetics obtained at their death a popular and unofficial canonization, and shortly afterwards a place in the local calendar analagous to that accorded to the illustrious martyrs.

One more custom may be mentioned as having a special interest for Irish readers, viz., that of the burial of Christians near the tombs of the saints. There is reason to believe that this originated during the first centuries, but from the fourth century onwards it became more common, as greater opportunities presented themselves by reason of the enlargement of the catacombic 'cubicula' and the building of churches.

The tomb of St. Cyprian, outside the city of Carthage, became the nucleus of a Christian cemetery. St. Eustella was buried near St. Eutropius; St. Paula, the friend of St. Jerome, was buried near the crib of Bethlehem; and Satyrus, the brother of St. Ambrose, at the left-hand of St. Nazarius. There was, in fact, a veritable fever to be placed near a sacred tomb. Some examples of art in the catacombs were irreparably destroyed by the sinking of loculi into the walls near the tomb of a favourite patron. Heedless of the decoration on the wall, a burial place was hollowed out to the utter destruction of the mural painting. A Roman archdeacon's epitaph sourly protests against the fashion, and advises Christians to imitate the virtues of the saints instead of clinging to their tombs.²

¹ Ep. xxii. ad Marcell. In the fifth century the custom of preserving the body of the saint, not in a crypt or 'confession,' but immediately under the mensa, was adopted in places, as may be seen in the ancient altar of St. Alexander in the Via Nomentana. Here a square opening in the front allows pilgrims to touch the reliquary with medals or other objects.

² The epitaph of Sabinus at San Lorenzo:—

'[N]il juvat, inmo gravat tumulis hærere piorum:
Sanctorum meritis optima vita prope est.
Corpore non opus est, anima tendamus ad illos,
Quæ bene salva, potest corporis esse salus.'

See article 'Ad Sanctos' in Cabrol's *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie et de Liturgie*.

The evidence which we have selected is but a small fraction of what is easily available.¹ Panegyrics, scriptural commentaries, liturgical texts, funerary inscriptions are saturated with *dulia*. In these centuries the saints entered into the inheritance of honour which was due to them.

In passing from these ages to the earlier period it must not be expected that a tithe of the evidence of these later times will be found. But, as in the case of prayers for the dead, enough of testimony has survived to allow us a glance of the same beliefs, the same instincts, the same practices even, germinating in the Christian Church. And I trust that we shall be able to observe between the earlier centuries and these later ones, a real continuity, an unbroken trend of development, 'in eodem scilicet dogmate, eodem sensu eademque sententia.'² The first document which meets us in our examination is an inspired one. In the sixth chapter of the Apocalypse the Apostle describes the opening of the seals. When the fifth seal was opened he saw 'under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held. And they cried with a loud voice, saying: O Lord (holy and true) dost thou not judge and revenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?' Whatever may be the darkness of the teaching in the Apocalypse, there is at least an allusion to the dignity of martyrdom in the eyes of the early Christian Church. Tertullian refers to this particular passage to prove that the martyrs attained immediately to the reward of Heaven.

Could one go further and see here a mystic's analogy drawn from the sight of the Christian sacrifice offered over the tomb of a martyr on earth? If this explanation is admitted we have here a testimony dating from the end of the first century of a custom to which, as we have seen, great stress was laid from the fourth century onwards.

¹ I have not even touched on the devotions to the Holy Angels or to our Lady. These proceeded on other lines, and could not, without unduly lengthening the article, receive treatment here.

² Const. Concil Vat. cap. iv.

In the light of it a passage in the anonymous treatise, *De aleatoribus*, written very early in the third century, receives a very real significance.¹

In any case, we have not to wait long for evidence of a public veneration accorded to the martyrs. St. Polycarp was condemned to be burnt at the stake in Smyrna, his episcopal city, in the year 155. The flames spared the body of the venerable old man, and an executioner stabbed him with a knife. The officer present ordered the corpse of the saint to be burnt according to custom. The martyrologist continues his narrative thus:—

We came to collect the bones, more precious to us than gems or pure gold, and they were placed in a fitting place. There it was that we held assembly, as soon as we could, with exaltation and joy, and God will accord us the consolation of celebrating the anniversary day of his death, so as, in the first place, to honour the memory of those who have already fought, and again so as to prepare generations to come to do the same.²

The celebration of this anniversary was long continued, for we read in the Passion of St. Pionius, who suffered under Decius in 250 at Smyrna, that Pionius while preparing for the anniversary of St. Polycarp by prayer received a premonition of his arrest.³

This custom was not universal at the earliest period. The epitaphs of Rome, which belong to the second century, do not give the date of the death of the martyr, as they would do, in all probability, if the anniversary were to be

¹ 'Be rather a Christian than a gambler, scatter thy money upon the Lord's altar, with Christ standing by and angels and martyrs as thy witnesses.'

² Ruinart, *Acta Sincera* (1689), p. 23. The martyrdom of Polycarp is among the most authentic acts. The martyrdoms at Lyons, recorded by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.*, v. 1), were followed by a similar attempt to deprive the Christians of the relics. 'The pagans, thinking to conquer the will of the Most High, and deprive the martyrs of the resurrection,' threw the corpses to the dogs, and afterwards burnt the remains and threw the ashes into the Rhone. For an account of the zeal of the pagans to destroy the bodies of martyrs, and the anxiety of the Christians to honour them, see *Six Lectures on Martyrdom*, Paul Allard (Transl. 'International Library').

³ *Passio S. Pionii*, Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, p. 123 and foll.

commemorated.¹ Nor does the Roman Calendar make any reference to the martyrs—like St. Justin—actually put to death in Rome at that time.² What were these festivals in honour of the martyrs? The information which we have concerning them is very fragmentary. They were, at this primitive period, what we might call memorial services. Tertullian connects them with the rites of Baptism, the Holy Eucharist, and funerary celebrations,³ as traditional customs in the Church. St. Cyprian, at a later period, does the same, and explicitly mentions the fact that the Holy Sacrifice was offered on these occasions.⁴ In another passage he requests Tertullus to acquaint him of the death of the confessors who were held in prison for the faith; for he wishes himself to join in spirit with the celebration made in their honour, promising on his return to commemorate them in company with his own clergy and people.⁵

Towards the end of the period there existed in Africa a custom which foreshadows our processes of canonization. Originally the title of martyr would be bestowed upon a Christian who died for the faith by the very fact of his giving up his life under such circumstances. But in the wholesale persecutions of Decius and Diocletian there were cases in which Christians of a very inferior type managed, from motives other than religion, to get arrested. There was a danger that these might secure, after their death, honour from the Church together with authentic martyrs. This led to the exercise of control on the part of the Bishops. We learn of this custom from the history of the Donatists by St. Optatus. He relates, while giving an account of the origin of the Donatist schism, an episode which took place before the persecution of Diocletian. A woman of Carthage, named Lucilla, was one of the bitter opponents of Cecilian, and St. Optatus explains why she

¹ Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, chap. viii.

² *Dict. d'Archéol. et de Liturgie*, 'Catacombes,' col. 2383, gives a sketch of the way in which the Roman Calendar comes to us.

³ *De Corona*, iii.

⁴ Ep. xxxiv.

⁵ Ep. xxxvii.

In the light of it a passage in the anonymous treatise, *De aleatoribus*, written very early in the third century, receives a very real significance.¹

In any case, we have not to wait long for evidence of a public veneration accorded to the martyrs. St. Polycarp was condemned to be burnt at the stake in Smyrna, his episcopal city, in the year 155. The flames spared the body of the venerable old man, and an executioner stabbed him with a knife. The officer present ordered the corpse of the saint to be burnt according to custom. The martyrologist continues his narrative thus:—

We came to collect the bones, more precious to us than gems or pure gold, and they were placed in a fitting place. There it was that we held assembly, as soon as we could, with exaltation and joy, and God will accord us the consolation of celebrating the anniversary day of his death, so as, in the first place, to honour the memory of those who have already fought, and again so as to prepare generations to come to do the same.²

The celebration of this anniversary was long continued, for we read in the Passion of St. Pionius, who suffered under Decius in 250 at Smyrna, that Pionius while preparing for the anniversary of St. Polycarp by prayer received a premonition of his arrest.³

This custom was not universal at the earliest period. The epitaphs of Rome, which belong to the second century, do not give the date of the death of the martyr, as they would do, in all probability, if the anniversary were to be

¹ 'Be rather a Christian than a gambler, scatter thy money upon the Lord's altar, with Christ standing by and angels and martyrs as thy witnesses.'

² Ruinart, *Acta Sincera* (1689), p. 23. The martyrdom of Polycarp is among the most authentic acts. The martyrdoms at Lyons, recorded by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.*, v. 1), were followed by a similar attempt to deprive the Christians of the relics. 'The pagans, thinking to conquer the will of the Most High, and deprive the martyrs of the resurrection,' threw the corpses to the dogs, and afterwards burnt the remains and threw the ashes into the Rhone. For an account of the zeal of the pagans to destroy the bodies of martyrs, and the anxiety of the Christians to honour them, see *Six Lectures on Martyrdom*, Paul Allard (Transl. 'International Library').

³ *Passio S. Pionii*, Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, p. 123 and foll.

commemorated.¹ Nor does the Roman Calendar make any reference to the martyrs—like St. Justin—actually put to death in Rome at that time.² What were these festivals in honour of the martyrs? The information which we have concerning them is very fragmentary. They were, at this primitive period, what we might call memorial services. Tertullian connects them with the rites of Baptism, the Holy Eucharist, and funerary celebrations,³ as traditional customs in the Church. St. Cyprian, at a later period, does the same, and explicitly mentions the fact that the Holy Sacrifice was offered on these occasions.⁴ In another passage he requests Tertullus to acquaint him of the death of the confessors who were held in prison for the faith; for he wishes himself to join in spirit with the celebration made in their honour, promising on his return to commemorate them in company with his own clergy and people.⁵

Towards the end of the period there existed in Africa a custom which foreshadows our processes of canonization. Originally the title of martyr would be bestowed upon a Christian who died for the faith by the very fact of his giving up his life under such circumstances. But in the wholesale persecutions of Decius and Diocletian there were cases in which Christians of a very inferior type managed, from motives other than religion, to get arrested. There was a danger that these might secure, after their death, honour from the Church together with authentic martyrs. This led to the exercise of control on the part of the Bishops. We learn of this custom from the history of the Donatists by St. Optatus. He relates, while giving an account of the origin of the Donatist schism, an episode which took place before the persecution of Diocletian. A woman of Carthage, named Lucilla, was one of the bitter opponents of Cecilian, and St. Optatus explains why she

¹ Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, chap. viii.

² *Dict. d'Archéol. et de Liturgie*, 'Catacombes,' col. 2383, gives a sketch of the way in which the Roman Calendar comes to us.

³ *De Corona*, iii.

⁴ Ep. xxxiv.

⁵ Ep. xxxvii.

became so hostile. Cecilian, when a deacon, had reproved her for kissing a relic, which she had, immediately before receiving Holy Communion. The relic, St. Optatus explains, was the bone 'of some dead man or other, a martyr it may be, but, if so, one who had not received official recognition.'¹

So far we have been occupied with the public and official cultus; a word must be added with regard to the private devotion of the faithful. The nature of the evidence in this period precludes the opportunity of very copious testimony. Christian inscriptions begin to be common only after the peace of the Church, and we are gleaning such information that there is to be found in the obscure period before the time of Constantine. The following, belonging admittedly to the third century, render with sufficient plainness the thoughts of the ordinary Christian in presence of the saints. In the Chapel of the Popes, discovered by De Rossi, have been discovered these inscriptions:—

Holy souls have in remembrance Marcianus Successus Severus and all our brethren.

Saint Sixtus have in remembrance in your prayers Aurelius Repentinus.

Holy souls ask that Verecundus and his friends may have a prosperous voyage.²

A few more of similar import can be found, but these are sufficient as typical of the popular veneration in which the martyrs were held, and the natural devotion with which they were invoked. We have not been permitted to hear the prayers that were offered by the faithful in their assemblies at the tombs of the martyrs, but we may judge from these private petitions that they turned to the saints for protection in their spiritual and temporal concerns.

There is scarcely any need to summarize what does

¹ St. Optatus, *De schis. Donat.*, lib. i. cap. xvi., 'si martyr is sed necdum vindicati.' See also in Allard, *op. cit.*, chap. x. sec. 3, an argument drawn from the title engraved on the tomb of Pope St. Fabian.

² Selected from inscriptions in Northcote and Brownlow, *Roma Sotterranea*, vol. i. p. 290.

not profess to be more than a summary, and that a very incomplete one ; but it may not be out of place to venture a few comprehensive sentences on the subject which has occupied this article and the preceding one in the January number. Nowadays, we can scarcely think of doctrine—or anything else—without the shadow of ‘development’ obtruding itself on our thought. What, then, is the principle of development in the doctrine of the Communion of Saints? Two or three times in these articles I have spoken of the Christian ‘instinct.’ By this one understands, not an irrational or casual sentiment, but an impulse, or rather a definite direction, imposed on the Christian mind by the authentic messengers of the Gospel truths. Christ was preached as the universal Lord and Judge of the living and the dead, and the centre of the kingdom which embraced this world and the world to come. The kingdom of Heaven came on men’s vision *sub specie unitatis*, it was one vast scheme. Other truths were announced together with this revelation of ‘the kingdom,’ and these gradually sought out one another, as if by mutual affinity, and coalesced into definite conceptions, or, one might say, rearranged themselves in the Christian consciousness. That death did not sever a Christian from the unity of the Church, that intercession is the general law of Christ’s Kingdom, that the imperfections of the moral life must be rigorously expiated—though it be in the world to come—that the prayer of the just will always avail with God, both here and hereafter: these are the elements which came together as materials for building up the theology of the ‘Communion of Saints.’

It needed only time and reflection, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to enable the Church to map out the provinces of this great spiritual kingdom, and ascertain the privileges and duties of every kind of citizen.

W. B. O’DOWD.

THE SCAPULAR TRADITION AND ITS DEFENDERS

IN the course of his article on the 'Scapular Promise' in the March number of the I. E. RECORD, the writer, Father James Rushe, does me the honour to refer more than once¹ to a former contribution of mine upon the same subject which appeared in this Review in July, 1904. At that time I was under the impression that in criticizing the views of my friend Father Benedict Zimmerman I was dealing with a scholarly modern defence of the Scapular tradition, sanctioned if not endorsed by the Carmelite body as a whole. It is, then, with considerable bewilderment that I have learned from Father Rushe's recent articles that this is not the case. Father Rushe, writing with some warmth and under warrant from the General of his Order, repudiates Father Zimmerman and rejects his explanations. It is true that the Carmelite Father in question is not actually named, but his identity is made manifest by references so unmistakable that it cannot for a moment remain in doubt.

The situation thus created inevitably lends a more personal tone to the discussion than would in itself be desirable if it could be avoided. That Father Zimmerman should feel himself precluded by a sense of loyalty to his superiors from making public reply to the *confrère* who has thus assailed him is very natural. None the less I hope he will pardon my seeming officiousness if, before offering some criticisms upon the new presentment of the Scapular revelation, I venture to touch upon the more general questions at issue between Father Rushe and himself. Even were I not myself the cause, it seems to me that I owe it to my former opponent to bear testimony to the scholarly attitude and honesty of purpose which, while sometimes attacking

¹ I. E. RECORD, March, 1911, pp. 266, 267, 268, 274, 278, 279, 283, 285.

his conclusions, I have always recognized in his work. Neither can I imagine any position more trying for a conscientious lover of truth than the situation in which he finds himself between his fellow-religious on the one hand, who consider him to yield far too much to the assailants of tradition, and the critics, on the other, who, like the Abbé Boudinhon,¹ the Abbé Saltet,² and myself, have upbraided him with conceding too little.

To come to the point at issue, the readers of this Review will not have forgotten that the recent sudden revival of the question of Carmelite origins found its occasion in an article contributed to the new *Encyclopædia Britannica* by Dom Cuthbert Butler, O.S.B., Abbot of Downside, a distinguished scholar, whose special knowledge of the early history of monasticism is recognized throughout Europe.³ Abbot Butler in this article rejected somewhat unceremoniously the legendary connexion of the Order with the Prophet Elias; whereupon Father Rushe, so he tells us, was instructed by his superior that loyal Carmelites ought no longer to remain silent 'while their sacred traditions were thus deliberately assailed' (page 29). He therefore esteemed it a privilege to enter a protest against 'this latest gibe at the remote antiquity of our origin' (page 51). Now that protest, while ostensibly directed in the first place against the *Encyclopædia Britannica* article, also repudiates in uncompromising terms 'the Carmelite friar' (i.e., Father B. Zimmer 1an) cited by Abbot Butler amongst his authorities. You must not trust this writer, Father Rushe equivalently tells us; Carmelite though he be, he speaks with no more authority than the *Catholic Dictionary* (page 36, note 1). He displays so much 'ignorance' of certain subjects of which he treats as to discredit the com-

¹ In the *Revue du Clergé Français*, 1903, p. 634. It can hardly be needful to inform the readers of the I. E. RECORD that M. Boudinhon is Professor of Canon Law in the Institut Catholique at Paris.

² *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique*, January, February, and March, 1911. M. Saltet is also well known as Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Institut Catholique of Toulouse.

³ One finds Abbot Cuthbert Butler appealed to as an authority on monastic origins by writers as diverse as Professor Harnack and Cardina Rampolla.

petence of the editors who allow such work to pass (page 45, note 4). He makes a parade of quoting 'authorities, not one of which affords a particle of positive evidence in support of his erroneous views' (ibid.). 'His vague knowledge of the origin of the Carmelites has been derived from sources upon which no critical student of the history of this Order would ever have relied' (page 34).

Now these are serious charges which cannot easily be tested. Before we allow ourselves to accept them without proof, justice requires that we should first be quite satisfied of the sound judgment, impartiality, and competence of the writer who speaks so confidently. There is a wise principle of the English law of evidence, that, under certain circumstances, when an accused person attacks the character of opposing witnesses he exposes himself to inquiry into his own right to be believed. So far as Father Zimmerman is known to the world of letters his record is in every way creditable. Before we deprive him of the honour due to the scholarly and conscientious investigator, we are justified in scrutinizing closely what I may call the mentality of those who dispute his claim to our respect. The situation as between Father Zimmerman and his Carmelite brethren is in any case a curious one, as the following facts will show. The dates, as the reader will perceive, are important.

In April, 1905, appeared the 15th fascicule of the great *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, edited by Vacant et Mangenot. In this the article 'Carmes, Ordre des' was contributed by Father Zimmerman, who, amongst his many other accomplishments, possesses that of being able to write in English, French, and German with equal facility. Now, in the article in question it is noteworthy that the writer frankly and simply surrenders the claim to continuity with Elias and the 'Sons of the Prophets.' The Order, according to him, began in the twelfth century. The treatise supposed to contain the first record of the Carmelite claim to remote antiquity, viz, the *De Institutione primorum monachorum*, instead of being written, as pretended, by John II., Bishop of Jerusalem, in the fifth century, is

really, so Father Zimmerman avers, a compilation of the thirteenth.¹

Now this article of Father Zimmerman, signed with his full name, was in no sense clandestine. It could not fail almost immediately to come under the notice of every member of his Order who was concerned with theological studies. None the less, when, more than six months later, the first fascicule of the *Monumenta historica Carmelitana* appeared, at the close of the year 1905, it is plain that Father Zimmerman still retained the full confidence of his superiors. The fascicule contained a very formal *imprimatur* from the Vicar-General of the Carmelites, dated September 8, 1905, in which Prior Zimmerman is called 'the very Reverend Father Benedict Maria a S. Cruce, a professed priest of our Province of England and Historiographer of our Order.' Moreover, on the back of the cover there is printed an appeal for assistance and support, addressed to the different Carmelite houses throughout the world, and signed by Father Zimmerman. It begins with the following words: 'Seeing that the General Chapter held in the month of April, 1901, imposed upon me the task of preparing a new history of the Order, I am glad to announce the publication of a series of documents concerning the Order which I have been able to collect from various libraries and archives.' The second fascicule of the *Monumenta*, which bears date 1906, is equally authenticated with both *imprimatur* and announcement. The third, which contains (see especially pages 235 and 267 ff.) a formal surrender of the unbroken descent from Elias, still repeats the *announcement* in the same terms, but it has simply *permissu superiorum* instead of the General's formal *imprimatur*. The fifth and last fascicule, published in 1907, again presents us with a formal *imprimatur*, but the General no longer calls Father Zimmerman 'Historiographer of the

¹ I know of no modern scholar of repute, and of hardly any ancient one, outside the Carmelite Order, who would for a moment dream of admitting that the *De Institutione primorum monachorum* was the genuine work of John, the Bishop of Jerusalem. But of this more will be said further on.

Order,' and the terms of the document are distinctly less cordial.¹

These facts and dates are surely of some interest. It is impossible to doubt the statement, thus formally repeated, that the General Chapter of the Carmelites in 1901 directed Father Zimmerman to prepare a history of the Order. It is equally impossible to shut our eyes to the fact that the scholar thus honoured by his brethren in 1901 had even then, or at any rate before 1905, come to the conclusion that the legends which connected the Order with the Prophet Elias were without serious foundation.² Moreover, in 1904, he had printed in the I. E. RECORD a series of articles on the Scapular which Father Rushe regards as seriously compromising the Carmelite tradition, and in which the writer plainly admitted that 'the Sabbatine Bull' of John XXII. cannot with certainty be traced further back than the year 1480.³ Nevertheless, in 1906, Father Benedict Zimmerman still retained the official style of Historiographer of the Order of Carmel.

Now there is, I venture to say, a fair presumption that the writer who was thus honoured by his fellow-religious, and who has contributed the article 'Carmelites,' and many other articles, to the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, as well as articles to the great *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie* of Abbot Cabrol, is not likely to be an ignoramus. If Father Rushe would have us believe that Father Zimmerman is too incompetent or too ill-informed to appreciate the weight of the arguments which may be urged in favour of Carmelite traditions the burden of proof lies with him. Father Zimmerman is in possession. There is little likelihood that he should be prejudiced against the traditional

¹ The *imprimatur* of September 8, 1905, ran: 'Perlibenter licentiam concedimus ut prædicta monumenta prelo committantur'; that of April 3, 1907, speaks of permission to print having been asked, and simply adds: 'petitam licentiam quantum ad nos attinet concedimus.'

² In his book, *Carmel in England*, published in 1899, Father Zimmerman already speaks in the most guarded way concerning the traditions of his Order. Referring to the descent from Elias, he says (p. 2): 'In the absence of documentary evidence, it must suffice for us to state the existence of a tradition, without taking upon ourselves the responsibility of proof either for or against its validity.'

³ I. E. RECORD, April, 1904, p. 351.

beliefs cherished in the Order of which he has always shown himself a loyal son—indeed his articles published in this Review prove the contrary; but it would be intelligible enough that his candid surrender of the position maintained by the Carmelites two hundred years ago should be little to the taste of many of his religious brethren. Hence we are led to ask what indications do Father Rushe's articles afford of his own mentality. Is he careful in his statements, rigorous in his proofs, and faithful to that character of a critical and scientific historian which he repeatedly claims for himself?¹

And here, at the outset, one cannot help expressing a doubt whether any scholar who was really in touch with modern work or methods of research could express either such naïve astonishment or such righteous indignation at the rejection of Carmelite traditions as we find in Father Rushe's January article. One could better understand its tone if Catholic historians were generally agreed in accepting the threefold claim which he regards as constituting the 'vital tradition of the Order.' This claim, he says, 'attributes the origin of the Carmelites to the Prophet Elias, upholds hereditary and uninterrupted succession from him as their veritable founder, and insists upon a specially privileged title that dates back to the very inauguration of this Institute.'² Is there, I venture to ask, a single modern historian of repute, Catholic or non-Catholic, who accepts any one of these three points? Certainly not Cardinal Hergenröther, or Funk, or Kraus, or Knöpfler, or, amongst older writers, Natalis Alexander, or Baronius, or Fleury, or the Bollandists, or among those who have dealt more particularly with the religious Orders, Hélyot in the eighteenth century or Heimbucher in the twentieth. Few writers have done more to influence the minds of the faithful at large in historical matters than the venerated Alban

¹ 'Being required to deal with the subject according to rigorously critical methods,' p. 284. 'Such *historical* facts as I am about to submit for genuinely critical investigation,' p. 269. 'I should be glad to submit a critical review of the MS. materials,' p. 31, note, etc.

² Page 35.

Butler. He deals with the matter in a footnote to his Life of Blessed Albert, Patriarch of Jerusalem, April 8. Although Alban Butler speaks in such a way as to avoid giving offence, can anyone claim him as a believer in the Carmelite tradition, or be for a moment in doubt as to what view he in reality held? Or let us take what is perhaps the most widely circulated of all the text-books of ecclesiastical history published in the nineteenth century—that of Alzog. The second edition of the English translation made from the ninth German edition was published both in Cincinnati and in Dublin in 1884. In this we read ¹ :—

The founder of the Carmelites was one Berthold, a monk and priest of Calabria, who, with a few companions, erected in 1156 a few huts on the heights of Mount Carmel, not far from the cave which the Prophet Elias had blessed by his presence. The huts were soon demolished to give place to a monastery. Mount Carmel, from its connection with the names of Elias and Eliseus, had been for centuries inhabited by anchorets desirous to perpetuate the memory of these prophets, and hence the Carmelites claimed Elias himself as their founder.

In a footnote the writer still more plainly states that Papenbroeck 'has got at the truth of this affair,'² which of course means that Alzog took the side of Father Papenbroeck in his long controversy with the champions of Carmelite traditions. Again, nothing could be more uncompromising than the article on the Carmelites contributed by Cardinal Hergenröther to the second volume of the *Kirchenlexikon*,³ published in 1883, and it is to be noted that the first edition thirty years earlier, a work that was translated into French and circulated everywhere, pronounced itself just as clearly on the same side.

With the best will in the world, then, to give all reasonable consideration to the protest of Father Rushe, we cannot help feeling that there is something unreal about his denunciations of the critics for their 'ignorance of the only

¹ Vol. ii. p. 497.

² Lest anyone should think that this is merely a German view, let him compare Marion, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, vol. ii. p. 524 (1905), or Wouters, *Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Compendium*, vol. ii. p. 230 (1863).

³ Vol. ii. p. 1966 ff.

recognized sources of authentic information regarding the basis of our history.' It is inconceivable that the scholars whose names I have quoted—and the list might be increased indefinitely—should all have been guilty of the same ignorance. Certain it is, none the less, that, ignorant or not, they all pronounce the same clear verdict, and reject unequivocally the triple Carmelite claim.

And now let me give another illustration of the mentality of our champion of tradition. In beginning his January article he remarks (page 30) : ' In undertaking this task I shall mainly confine myself to ancient documents and codices the authenticity of which has never yet been seriously impugned.' Now, as anyone will see who reads the article carefully, the whole of Father Rushe's historical proof of the connexion of the Carmelites with Elias turns ultimately on one authority, viz., the above-mentioned treatise *De Institutione primorum Monachorum ad Caprasium*, supposed to have been written in A.D. 412 by John, Patriarch of Jerusalem.¹ Is this a document ' the authority of which has never yet been seriously impugned ' ? Presumably the writer would answer in the negative, for he himself tells us (page 45) of the objections to its authenticity raised by Baronius, and echoed by De la Bigne. What, however, Father Rushe fails to tell us is that not only did Baronius feel ' difficulties,' but that the whole learned world during the last two centuries has endorsed his uncompromising rejection of the tract as spurious. There is not, as far as I know, one single authority upon patristic matters who believes in the authenticity of this vitally important work on the ' Institution of the First Monks.' It is not only Baronius, but Cardinal Bellarmine, Dom Ceillier, Labbe, Fabricius, Natalis Alexander, Fessler, Papenbroeck, Alzog, Bardenhewer, even Theophilus Raynaud, the ' learned Jesuit theologian,' whom Father Rushe commends so highly for his defence of the Scapular.² There is not one of all these who accepts the treatise as a genuine work of the

¹ See pp. 36-46, and cf. in the second article pp. 278, 279.

² Pp. 285 and 287.

fifth century, and yet Father Rushe criticizing a scholar of the standing of Abbot Butler can accuse him because he ignores this work of 'endeavouring to retard the cause of historical truth.' Indeed he goes on to declare:—

In other circumstances their attitude [i.e., the attitude of those who reject the Carmelite traditions] might not be so leniently interpreted, if we declined to accept the plea of ignorance of the *facts* recorded by John of Jerusalem, since knowledge would argue a most reprehensible trifling with the sacred sources whence the holy Patriarch's information had been chiefly drawn.¹

'The facts recorded by John of Jerusalem'! Can Father Rushe mention the name of a single scholar of eminence, outside the Carmelite body, who believes that John of Jerusalem recorded any such 'facts.' If anyone wishes to see for himself what is the view taken of this treatise by patristic scholars, let him consult, I will not say the Bollandist Papenbroeck, but the Benedictine Dom Ceillier, or the Dominican Natalis Alexander.² The arguments for rejecting the authenticity of the treatise are there given in some detail, but they are not exhaustive. For example, these critics, I think, say nothing of an entire chapter in this short treatise consecrated to a prophetic vision of Elias in which he foresaw the birth of Mary, and was supernaturally enlightened as to her Immaculate Conception. To everyone familiar with the tone of the early dogmatic dissertations on the subject composed by Eadmer and his imitators in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the resemblance with the following passage from the alleged Treatise of John of Jerusalem will be patent:—

A quibus [the companions of Elias] traditum tenemus Deum, sua figurata visione, revelasse tunc Eliae quatuor magna mysteria, quae per ordinem explicabo: Primo, quod quaedam infantula

¹ Pp. 41, 42. The word *facts* is italicized by Father Rushe himself. I am not quite sure that I catch the drift of this sentence, but the writer seems to say that it is only by an exercise of charity that he can excuse the critics from wilful blindness to overwhelming evidence.

² Ceillier, *Histoire générale des Auteurs ecclésiastiques* (Paris, 1742), vol. x. p. 96; Natalis Alexander, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (Venice, 1770), vol. iv. p. 328, and vol. viii. p. 188.

nasceretur, quae ex utero matris suae ab omni peccato munda egrederetur : secundo, tempus in quo hoc adimpleretur : tertio, quod haec infantula virginitatem perpetuam ad exemplum Eliae amplexaretur : quarto quod Deus jungens naturam suam humanae, de vigne illa homo nasceretur. Per hoc namque quod ille puer Eliae vidit de mari nubeculam parvam oriri, revelavit Deus Eliae, quod quaedam infantula, scilicet beata Maria, per illam nubeculam significata, et instar illius nubeculae per humilitatem parva, nasceretur de humana natura peccatrice, designata per mare, quae infantula jam in suo ortu esset munda ab omni peccatorum sorde, quemadmodum nubecula illa de mari amaro orta sine tamen aliqua amaritudine.¹

And again :—

Beata tamen Maria de hoc mari, id est natura humana, aliter fuit orta. Quoniam in suo ortu non fuit onerata amaritudine delictorum, sed instar illius nubeculae fuit levis per immunitatem peccatorum et dulcis per plenitudinem charismatum.²

If this passage were genuinely the work of a writer in the fifth century it would be invaluable to professors of dogma as a proof of the antiquity of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Has any one of them ever dreamed of appealing to it? I think not. The fact is that patristic students are well aware that writers in the fifth century did not discuss these topics or use such language, whereas these were the matters most keenly debated in the thirteenth century by theologians of all schools. If we did indeed possess such a treatise on primitive and pre-Christian monasticism written by a contemporary of St. Jerome, it would be a work of inestimable value, and would long ere this have been edited and annotated by the first scholars of the day. As it is, the document was considered too worthless to be included even in Migne's *Patrology*, and while most non-Catholic authorities regard it as unworthy of notice, the few that make any reference to it speak with contempt of

¹ *De Institutione primorum Monachorum ad Caprasium*, cap. xxxix. Ed. Wastel, Brussels, 1643, tom. i. p. 27.

² *Ibid.*

the attempts made to vindicate its genuineness.¹ Such is that treatise *On the Institution of the First Monks* upon which in our own day, as in the days of Horneby and Baconthorpe, the defence of the Carmelite traditions ultimately depends. It is to me only another illustration of the mentality of Father Rushe that, instead of seriously setting to work to prove the authenticity of this primary document, he spends his time in telling us that he has himself examined the (fourteenth century) manuscripts containing it, and conceives that this is the only method of submitting the work 'to the test of any standard of scientific scrutiny recognized in our own exacting age.'² As in the case of almost every passage quoted, with a profusion of MS. references in the course of his two articles, the text has been quite accurately printed centuries ago. The dispute does not turn in any way upon the correctness of the readings, but upon the authorship of the original document. That the work existed in the fourteenth century as it was printed by Wastel in the seventeenth, no one can dream of questioning. The only point of importance is whether the text in any shape or form originated in the time of John of Jerusalem. So far as I have been able to investigate the matter, the accredited scholarship of the last three centuries declares with one unanimous voice that this is impossible.³

Not less striking as illustrating the mentality of the author of the protest is the vehemence with which he repudiates what he calls 'certain legends and pious surmises,' and declares the strictures of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* article to be without justification. Now, the article does not pre-

¹ See p. 44.

Speaking of the Carmelite Wastel's plea in behalf of the authenticity of the treatise, Gaspari says: 'Seine (i.e., Wastel's) Annahmen und Behauptungen haben ausserhalb seines Ordens mit Recht nur Zweifel und Verwerfung gefunden' (Gaspari, *Ungedruckte Quellen*, i. 165, Cristiania, 1866.)

Dean Freemantle in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, says: 'An attempt was made by Wastel to attach to John several anonymous writings, a treatise on early Monasticism, a commentary on Job, etc. . . . The work seems absolutely devoid of foundation, and no one has been convinced by it' (Vol. iii. p. 381).

² See p. 44.

³ There seems to be equal unanimity among critics in rejecting the authenticity of the narrative attributed to St. Cyril of Constantinople.

tend to define the nature of the Carmelite tradition. It only says that these stories were seriously put forward¹ and believed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and that this is substantially true, it seems to me, in the face of the works of such approved writers as Father Daniel a Virgine Maria, Father Anthony a Spiritu Sancto, and many others, to be impossible to question. Father Rushe rather indignantly denies (page 42) that the Carmelites ever 'seriously put forward and believed that our Lady as well as the Apostles enrolled herself in the Order.' It is true, no doubt, that Father Daniel a Virgine Maria and the other leading representatives of the Carmelites did not quite put the matter in this crude way. They did not actually say that our Lady and the Apostles joined the Carmelite Order, but yet they went very near it. They said that our Lady and some of the Apostles lived as religious, practising poverty, chastity, and obedience, that our Lady presided over a community of virgins wearing a brown habit with a white cloak, that she frequently visited the monks of Carmel, and that the rule which she and her virgins followed was the rule of the Essenes, this being also the rule of the monks of Mount Carmel founded by Elias, who at a later date elected to be known as Carmelites.² To this extent the article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* does perhaps misrepresent the tradition championed by Father Rushe. I can only leave it to the reader to judge what this misrepre-

¹ It must be clear to any fair-minded person that by the phrase 'put forward' the writer does not mean to suggest that all the stories were then necessarily invented for the first time, but only that the Carmelite writers of that age gave them currency and argued in favour of their truth.

² For example: 'Si quis quaerat cuius instituti fuerint eiusmodi collegia seu monasteria sacrarum virginum in primitiva ecclesia, respondendum videtur eiusdem disciplinae esse cum Essenis (i.e., the Carmelites) posteris SS. prophetarum, Eliae et Elisaei—et quidem de ipsa Virgine superbenedicta Maria, eruitur ex ipsius vestibus jam ante descriptis eiusdem sane coloris ut olim et modo usu sunt in Ordine Carmelitano, nativi scilicet coloris pulli et albi' (*Vinea Carmeli*, p. 716). Or again: 'Haec autem sanctissima Virgo (Maria) multociens ad Montem Carmelum veniebat et cum Carmelitis saepe saepius conversabatur' (*Primatus seu Principatus Eliae*, by Anthony a Spiritu Sancto; Lyons, 1671, p. 29). The reader who will further take the trouble to consult pp. 714, 715, 716 of the *Vinea Carmeli* (Antwerp, 1662), by Father Daniel a Virgine Maria, will find the exact justification of each of the statements made in the text above.

sentation precisely amounts to—the more so when we study such a passage as the following, occurring under the name of the Blessed Virgin Mary in a long catalogue of Carmelite celebrities :—

Quam [i.e., Virginem Mariam] non solum felices nos Carmelicolæ talem habuisse et singularem sacri Heliani Ordinis tutelarem veram et professatricem Monasteriorumque institutricem et reatricem gloriamur. Imitatricem (fas sit dicere) vel etiam Magni Heliæ profitemur, prima enim se inter mulieres, ut inter homines igneus ille divinusque Zelator, voto castitatis ad instantiam Carmelitarum, ut asserit et antiquissimis auctoribus B. Baptista mantuanus, adstrinxit—Jure igitur multo, inter felices Heliadas [i.e., the followers of Elias] celsior Angelis et hominibus, sacra ista et divinissima Virgo numeranda venit.¹

I do not presume to interpret these phrases too exactly, but they certainly seem to go near saying that our Blessed Lady took religious vows, or at least a religious vow, at the instance of the Carmelites of her time. Indeed, the very fact of the inclusion of her name in a list of the illustrious members of the Order seems to be not a little significant. With regard to the Apostles, there is probably no sufficient ground for alleging that they were also claimed as religious, but other books show that one or two have been so spoken of, while in the case of St. John the Baptist it is not disputed that like Esdras, Judas Macchabeus, St. Ignatius Martyr, St. Dionysius the Areopagite, and other famous saints he is numbered among the Generals of the Order.²

To sum up, then, I venture, to urge that, in any attempt to hold the balance between Father Zimmerman and his brother religious, it is impossible to regard the latter as a scientific historian or as paying any regard to those critical

¹ Marc. Antonio Alegre de Casanate, *Paradisus Carmelitæi Decoris*, p. 45.

² All these are to be found in the *Primates seu Principatus Eliæ*, by Father Anthony a Spiritu Sancto, published at Lyons, 1671, p. 26. The fuller notice about St. John the Baptist in the same work includes such statements as the following: 'Anno autem mundi 4071 et Christi 27 coepit Joannes Baptista, jam factus ordinis Carmelitani Generalis, prædicare et baptizare. . . . Mortuo igitur Domino nostro Jesu Christo, in die Pentecostes sequenti, multi Carmelitani erant in Coenaculo cum Apostolis super quos descendit Spiritus Sanctus' (ibid., p. 29).

methods he invokes so freely. In such divergence of opinion as we find between them concerning the historical data of the Scapular question the presumption must be that the view of Father Zimmerman is the better founded, and that, in default of definite evidence, any mere expression of dissent on the part of Father Rushe is not to be considered. For in truth one cannot shut one's eyes to the fact that not a little bias and prejudice seems to have been imported into the discussion by those members of the Carmelite Order to whom Father Zimmerman's surrender of their traditions is unacceptable. The tone of the article in the January number of this Review is moderation itself in comparison with the language used in another attack on Father Zimmerman which appears in the first number of the *Études historiques et critiques sur l'Ordre de N.D. du Mont Carmel*, published in February.

'It is necessary,' says Père Marie-Joseph, the writer of the article, after naming Father Benedict Zimmerman, and mentioning that he is an English Carmelite living at Wincanton, 'to examine without any infringement of religious charity what is the genesis of this critical spirit in B. Z.'

A German Swiss, the son of a minister [*fils de pasteur*], his mind saturated in his early upbringing with Protestant critical ideas, he has devoted himself since his conversion and reception into the English Province of the Carmelites to a minute study of the history of the Order, with all that repugnance for tradition which marks those who have been brought up in the religion of the so-called Reformation. Papenbroeck, Launoy, John Bale, an apostate Carmelite, and a certain John Nepomucene, also an ex-Carmelite, have become his favourite authors. Anyone may learn from the bibliography of his writings, to which M. Saltet makes reference, how unwearied have been his efforts during the last fifteen years to propagate his peculiar views.¹

Further, it is stated in the same article that 'the whole past history of our venerable Order must rise up to protest emphatically against these calumnious imputations which B. Z. strives to scatter broadcast, but especially in our

¹ *Études historiques et critiques, etc.* (February, 1911), pp. 5, 6.

native France';¹ or again: 'we should never end if we were to call attention to all the contradictions and blunders which swarm in the writings of B. Z.'² But if so, we may remark parenthetically, how curious that the same B. Z. should have been selected by a General Chapter as recently as 1901 to write the history of the Order!

It would serve no useful purpose to quote further; but there is one allegation made, to which I venture to direct attention, because the readers of the I. E. RECORD who may remember the articles published by Father Zimmerman in 1904 will be able to judge for themselves of the amount of prejudice which colours these estimates of his character and work. What are we to think of an opponent who does not hesitate to say: 'B. Z. makes relentless war on the Scapular. His purpose is to discredit it, and to accomplish this he labours to prove that the Order made no account of it for more than two centuries.'³

Even though a reader had little interest in the rights or wrongs of the question, it would be impossible for anyone, especially anyone who knew Father Zimmerman personally and appreciated his earnest piety and love of truth, not to sympathize with him in the situation created by these attacks. It must have required no little courage in him to state fearlessly his conviction that the learned world is right and the historians of his Order wrong in their treatment of the legendary descent from Elias. But it is sad that to the private mortifications and worries created by such a divergence of view there should now be added the pain of publicity, and we cannot but regret that the world at large should be invited to draw the inference that intellectual honesty in historical matters is not on the whole encouraged by the ascetical Orders of the Church.

HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

¹ *Études, etc.*, p. 7.

² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 9: 'B. Z. poursuit à outrance le scapulaire. Il veut le discréditer, et, pour y arriver, il s'efforce d'établir que l'Ordre n'en a tenu aucun compte pendant plus de deux siècles.'

BIBLICAL MEMORIES IN PALESTINE: OLD TESTAMENT

IN travelling through Palestine we cannot help feeling struck at the wonderful similarity between the customs of the inhabitants of to-day and those of the Bible. We may see there that the flocks follow the shepherd as they 'know his voice,' that the professional corn-measurer yet sits down beside the heap of corn in autumn and takes care that the buyer obtains 'a good measure, pressed down and shaken together and running over'; and that the Palestinian swears still with the same volubility and variety of expression as did his ancestor whom Christ exhorted in His sermon on the Mount to 'swear not.' We may see that to-day the 'virgins go out to meet the bridegroom,' just as they used to do two thousand years ago when Jesus spoke the parable of the wise and foolish maidens; that the Lake of Genesareth is as stormy and treacherous as it was when the Apostles cried out to the Master to save them from perishing, and that it is as easy for an old man to-day to obey the order 'to take up his bed' as it was in those days when the Divine Saviour cured the sick and lame in Galilee or Judea.

This and various other instances drawn from the New Testament may be given to illustrate the wonderful vitality of custom in Palestine.

On close inspection one finds he can discover a similar identity existing between many Palestinian customs of the present time and those that were in vogue long before Christ came on earth. In order to understand the motley population which he sees scattered over the country, he must open the Old Testament; he must watch Moses legislating and Josue acting in disobedience to Jehovah regarding certain injunctions received relative to the Promised Land. A little patient study and observation suffices to convince one that if the mode of life in the Palestine of

Jesus obtains to-day, so also does that of the Land of Promise, with which the Old Testament has familiarized us.

Opening Deuteronomy xii. 2-3, we find that God, among other instructions given to the Israelites regarding the treatment which they should mete out to those whom they were to encounter in their new home, said :—

Destroy all the places in which the nations, that you shall possess, worshipped their gods upon high mountains, and hills, and under every shady tree :

Overthrow their altars, and break down their statues, burn their groves with fire, and break their idols in pieces : destroy their names out of those places.

And in the Book of Judges we find the spirit of disobedience for which ' the stiff-necked people ' had made themselves remarkable since the day they had left Egypt was once more to guide their conduct :—

But the sons of Benjamin did not destroy the Jebusites that inhabited Jerusalem : and the Jesubite hath dwelt with the sons of Benjamin in Jerusalem until this present day.

Manasses also did not destroy Bethsan and Thanac with their villages, nor the inhabitants of Dor, and Jeblaam, and Megeddo with their villages. And the Chanaanite began to dwell with them.

But after Israel was grown strong he made them tributaries, and would not destroy them.¹

And an angel of the Lord went up from Galgal to the place of weepers, and said : I made you go out of Egypt, and have brought you into the land for which I swore to your fathers : and I promised that I would not make void my covenant with you for ever. On condition that you should not make a league with the inhabitants of this land, but should throw down their altars : and you would not hear my voice : why have you done this ?²

Thus we see that the idolaters, instead of being exterminated, as the Divine decree had ordered, were allowed to remain, and were made serfs in the land of which Jehovah had deprived them. So tenaciously have they retained

¹ Judges i. 21, 27, 28.

² Judges ii. 1, 2.

their hold that they are to this day firmly fixed in Palestine, although their sometime conquerors are now scattered all over the world ; and in the Felaheen to-day they are quite as idolatrous as they were when the Israelites arrived there after their years of wandering in the desert.

They keep no Sabbath [writes Mr. Lang Neil], there comes for them no day of rest. Day after day, week after week, their work continues, with little or no interruption but that which may be directly connected with their lives of toil. They are practically heathens believing in charms both manifold and curious, holy tombs, sacred groves, strange places set apart for devotional purposes, spirits with good or evil intent.

They still worship in many cases on mountain-tops, especially if an isolated tree stands thereon ; remnants of their ancient tongue is discovered in the Arabic which their Moslem conquerors forced upon them a thousand years ago ; they are generally Mohammedans in name, though the old beliefs have never become extinct. And there you find those wretched people still in Palestine—a living monument to the truth of Scripture, a standing reproach to a favoured race.

In Palestine, among the children of the Desert, just as among Corsicans and Sicilians until very recently, the terrible vendetta proved a standing menace to peace. After providing for sanctuaries to which a homicide might retire secure from avengers until such time as a fair trial could be obtained, Providence laid down in the Book of Numbers very concise ordinances regarding a murderer :—

If any man strike with iron, and he die that was struck : he shall be guilty of murder, and he himself shall die. If he throw a stone, and he that is struck die : he shall be punished in the same manner. . . . The kinsman of him that was slain, shall kill the murderer : as soon as he apprehendeth him, he shall kill him.¹

And again in the Book of Genesis :—

. . . At the hand of every man, and of his brother, will I require the life of man. Whosoever shall shed man's blood, his blood shall be shed : for man was made to the image of God.²

¹ Numb. xxxv. 16-19.

² Gen. ix. 5, 6.

To this hour in Palestine this injunction is as scrupulously observed as it was that year so long ago when it issued from the lips of Jehovah ; for immediately after a murder the duty of revenge devolves upon the nearest male relative of the murdered man. Sooner or later the deed of blood is wiped out by aid of the knife, unless sufficient pecuniary compensation be paid ; for as they put it : ' blood calls for blood.'

If revenge is kept alive [says a recent writer], and waits for the opportunity that will sooner or later appear, if the murder be a brutal one, it is the right and proper thing to take the life of the first member of the murderer's family that may be met. The feud then increases in intensity, and many lives are lost before the cry for blood is appeased.

But luckily the hospitality which is so characteristic of the East steps in here to over-rule even the vendetta. Should a murderer break bread with a householder, the latter is forthwith bound to protect his guest as long as he remains in his tent or his house ; and though the guest happens to be the very murderer whom he has long sought, but whom he has come to entertain without recognizing as his enemy until too late, the homicide is safe so long as he remains under his host's roof.

Among the Children of the Desert in the East a story is told to illustrate the inviolability with which this law is observed among them. During an altercation over the breed of an Arab steed an Oriental slew his friend and made good his escape. Many years went by, but the crime remained unpunished, though the dead man's son, upon whose shoulders the onus of vengeance had fallen, was tireless in quest of his prey. At length one sultry evening, when the burning sun of the tropics had spent the force of his rays upon the desert sands, a lone horseman rode up to a tent and demanded food and shelter for the night ; for he had lost his way and had yet far to go. With cries of joy the wanderer was greeted, and presently he was sitting with his host at a substantial meal of hot cakes, sweet milk,

and kid. Supper ended, conversation flowed free; but soon the host, lately so communicative and cordial, grew strangely chilling in his manner.

'You will now retire to rest,' he at length observed, in a constrained tone of voice, 'for you will arise early on the morrow and ride fast.' Taken somewhat aback at the strange manner of his host, whose kindly manner had proved so fascinating at first, the stranger retired to rest. Before the dawn of day he awoke to find his host calling him with forced calmness. 'Rise,' said the latter, 'and take refreshment. Your steed stands ready without my tent.'

The guest arose in surprise, and did as he had been bid; then, pushing aside the tent-flap, he was astonished to find his horse saddled and pawing impatiently to depart.

'Mount quickly and ride hard, for in ten minutes the sun rises,' said the host pointing upwards to the grey sky with true Oriental impassiveness, even though his bosom surged like the ocean. 'Until then you are my guest. As soon as the first streak illumines the sky I shall pursue you to life or death—for during our conversation last night I discovered that you are the murderer of my father.'

'Thy word is a lamp to my feet, and a light to my paths,'¹ cried the Royal Psalmist, as he sang the praises of the beauty of virtue, which consists in the observance of the Divine law. Each night this similitude is illustrated. Nobody will go any distance from his home after dark without a lantern, which is held at the feet to direct one's footsteps. The necessity for such a precaution will be apparent on recalling the fact that in most Eastern towns the streets are unpaved, while the removal of obstacles that may be thrown there and of the mud that gathers in the holes is so rare as to mark the time on which the process of scavenging takes place quite a red-letter day in the town-people's lives. Another reason that induces one to bring outdoors with him a light at night is due to the suspicious mind of the Oriental. To walk the streets after nightfall without a light renders

¹ Ps. cxviii. 105.

one liable to be arrested as 'an undesirable citizen' whose intentions cannot be above reproach, since 'men loved darkness rather than light, for their works were evil.'

It is to be expected that such a conservative people as the Israelites should adhere with special tenacity to the musical instruments used by their forefathers, as well as to the traditional form of dance. Perhaps it is true to say that in all Scripture there is nothing mentioned so often as music and everything pertaining to it. In Genesis iv. and xxi., in Job xxi. and xvi., and in Samuel, we find the harp, a species of triangular lyre, mentioned several times; in Judges, Ezechiel, Genesis, and the Psalms, the timbrel, by which most now understand the tambourine, played to the accompaniment of cymbals, is frequently named; then the pipe, flute, dulcimer, trumpet, cornet and organ—by which last instrument we are to understand a number of pipes placed in a wind-box and blown either by the mouth or by means of a bellows—are referred to so often as to make mention of the sources unnecessary. Strange to say, after all the centuries that have rolled by, those kinds of instruments are yet in use among the people; for a feast to-day music and dancing form part of the programme which are considered as factors *sine qua non* in the entertainment.

In the castles of the old Irish chiefs, and in the houses of the great Italian families, the bard who could sing improvised songs was ever a welcome guest. Among the people of the Holy Land he always was, and still remains, a personage of no ordinary importance. Harsh though be his voice, and unmelodious his tune, he is ever in request, for he is the 'sweet singer' who is not to be found every day. The *improvisatore* of to-day, just as in the time of the Royal Psalmist, pays but little attention to harmony: his voice never exceeds the range of three notes; and his chant, which comes spontaneously from his heart, strongly reminds one, by reason of its form, of the psalms of the penitent King David. That lines and ideas are repeated over and over again in the same chant seems to matter not; neither is a large variety of ideas expected, for in these matters the Oriental peasant is far from exact-

ing. The present writer remembers being rowed on the Sea of Galilee, some years back, from Tiberias to Capernaum, by four stout boatmen. Standing upright—for a Galilean usually prefers to use his oars in that position—they sought to beguile the distance, some fifteen kilometres, by chanting their traditional boat-song. The whole composition consisted of not more than three or four lines, which they kept repeating for the hour and a half during which they vigorously applied themselves to the oars. To the singers the monotonous chant seemed productive of infinite pleasure, if one were to judge from the vivacity and enthusiasm that lit up their bronzed faces at certain words; although the dull, monotonous chant that never exceeded a range of more than two or three notes proved anything but a source of pleasure to their reluctant audience.

We are told that to show his joy for the safe conduct of the Ark 'David danced with all his might before the Lord,' which proceeding—however indecorous our age might deem such conduct in the case of any reigning monarch—was one full of homage to the Almighty, and one in which he was no doubt ably seconded by his subjects, notwithstanding the fact that 'Michol, daughter of Saul, on seeing King David leaping and dancing, despised him in her heart.'

In his dancing David recognized no rules; the only rule observed in the East on such an occasion, then as now, is that which is exacted by the emotion under which the person labours for the time being. The movements of the body are slow, quick, or fantastic, according to the manner in which the dancer wishes to demonstrate the joy which he feels; for so untrammelled is he by such conventionalities as regulate European dances that great would be his consternation if he were required to submit to any instructions on the point from a professional, except in so far as those observations might guide his deportment in a general manner amid a group of merry-makers.

Writing on hospitality accorded him by the parish priest of the village of Jiffne two years ago, a learned Dominican recalls an instance of the modern method of dancing which

will closely tally with that used by their ancestors of three thousand years ago :—

At supper [writes the traveller] he told us that a marriage was to take place in the morning, and that nearly the whole village had fasted in preparation for it. Also, that after the day's work was over, for three evenings the unmarried men of the village had a dance. As he was going, we were only too glad to accompany him. I saw as much reverence and joy expressed at his appearance as would be shown in Kerry or Donegal. There were only men and boys in the room. About twenty young fellows were standing as close together as they could in the dance, sometimes like the letter S, sometimes the line was like the letter C, or crescent-shaped. They bent forward or leant to either side, with most extraordinary precision and gracefulness. All the time they slapped their hands as an accompaniment to Arab songs.

These described life in the desert, the sorrow of the parents at parting with the bride, etc. Then we had a Syrian sword dance most gracefully executed. It was a scene for a painter like Salvatore Rosa, the most extraordinary one I ever witnessed. What I call a room might pass for a cave, for there was neither chair nor table in it. It was filled with turbaned men, whose countenances, dark flashing eyes, and wild enthusiasm might have led one to think they were Bedouin robbers; but no, they were all devout Catholics. The parish priest told us that all would be at the Nuptial Mass in the morning, that the day would be a holiday, and that the ceremonies and rejoicings would last till evening.

The one great desire cherished by the married women of the Old Testament was to bear children, to illustrate which fact various examples may be adduced from the sacred writings. To be childless meant for them to be the object of scorn; since their affliction was regarded as a special visitation on the part of Providence. We know from Genesis to what extraordinary means 'Rachel seeing herself without children' had recourse, and we can well understand her joy on being able to say with truth: 'God hath taken away my reproach.' And the same source informs us of a similar means employed by cranky old Sara, who feared to be pointed out as 'the childless one.'

The desire of the peasant woman of Palestine for the love and care of little ones to-day is quite as keen as it was of old. Her lot in general is a wretched one ; for, outside the pale of Christianity, she has not that rank or equality with her husband which Christ imparted when he raised marriage to the dignity of a Sacrament. Her life is little better than that of a slave ; in the eyes of her lord and master she is rather a ' thing ' than a human being, whose duty it is to drudge while she is able and when she is not, well—to leave this world as quietly and quickly as possible. Moreover, in a moment of anger or discontent her husband can divorce her with an ease which even certain countries that are so famous in modern days for ' separation facilities ' cannot boast of. All this makes her desire to be surrounded by offspring intense, and her sorrow at its absence correspondingly keen.

Anna, wife of Elcana, mentioned in 1 Kings, being childless and, on that score, grievously afflicted by the sharp tongue of her rival Phenenna, is an excellent prototype of the barren peasant woman of Palestine in our days. ' O Lord of hosts,' prayed Anna at the temple with such fervour that Heli concluded she had taken more wine than was good for her, ' if thou wilt look down on the affliction of thy servant, thy handmaid, and wilt give to thy servant a man-child, I will give him to the Lord all the days of his life, and no razor shall come upon his head.'

And her barren daughter of our days will also pray fervently and make a vow, but her prayers and her vow will be directed to King David, in whose intercession with Allah on this particular point the women of Palestine possess unbounded confidence. To make assurance doubly sure, the Moslem woman will promise to offer up sacrifice of thanksgiving to the Prophet David at the so-called tomb of the Hebrew monarch, which has long since been appropriated as a Moslem shrine and is annually visited by large numbers of Mohammedan pilgrims. If the traveller be lucky enough, he may meet with one of those pious dames hauling along the road a lamb or calf to be immolated at the popular shrine of the Royal Psalmist, through whose

intercession, as she avers, the stigma of barrenness has been removed from her, so that she may now no longer be pointed out as 'the childless one.'

'For I am become like a bottle in the frost!' cried out the Psalmist in Psalm cxviii. 83 to the Lord. As you pass to-day through the streets of Jerusalem, you meet with men carrying the same kind of bottles mentioned by the Psalmist. They are the bottles—it is needless, of course, to recall they are not, and never were, composed of glass—to which Christ referred when He explained to the disciples of St. John the Baptist that there was no necessity for their squeamishness regarding the fact that His disciples did not fast: 'Neither do they put new wine into old bottles. Otherwise the bottles break, the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish. But new wine is put into new bottles: and both are preserved.'

The same species of bottles, the skin of a goat, of which the Psalmist, and long after him Jesus Christ Himself, spoke, is still used all over Palestine, and especially in Jerusalem, both for water and wine.

The larger bottles [says a popular handbook on the Scriptures] were made of the skin of a he-goat, the smaller of a kid's skin. When the animal was killed, they cut off its feet and its head, and they drew it in this manner out of its skin, without cutting it open; they afterwards dressed the inside of the skin with tannin, and having sewn up the apertures at the legs and tail, filled the skin with a decoction of bark and water until saturated. When used for wine, the skins were hung up in the houses, and so became soaked and shrivelled. . . . They were mended by stitching on a patch and covering it with pitch.

In the hot season in every part of Jerusalem, and in some parts of Cairo, the water-carriers, each loaded with a bottle filled with water, parade the streets during the day for the purpose of allaying the dust. Opening the aperture in the goat-skin, through which one of the feet of a frisky animal once protruded, the municipal employee scatters the water over as great a space as he can; and then, hitching the empty 'bottle' on his back again, he returns to refill it.

Here, as in Egypt, one feels interested in the professional water-vendor who cries out to¹ the passers-by at the top of his voice: 'O, ye thirsty ones, come and drink of the water for nothing, without money and without price!' an invitation which everybody understands to be a euphemism for the notice that a drink of the precious liquid—and, in Jerusalem at least, good water is indeed precious—can be had at not more than a penny a glass. And to-day when you approach the water-vendor with the customary coin you find that he will draw from the kind of skin-bottle (unless he belongs to the *élite* of the 'profession' and therefore has adopted the use of a copper vessel) to which Psalm cxviii. refers. Such is the longevity of Biblical customs in Palestine.

'You have nothing to do with us to build a house to our God, but we ourselves will build to the Lord our God, as Cyrus King of the Persians hath commanded us.'¹ Even to this day the effects of this refusal of the Israelites to allow the Samaritans a share in the erection of a temple to the living God is evident in Samaria. After the Israelites had been carried into captivity, as the Books of Kings tell us, the King of Assyria colonized the depopulated country by a motley crowd of heathens belonging to different nations, among whom the old pagan rites continued in their new abode. But terrified by a plague which threatened to exterminate their race, they petitioned the Assyrian monarch to send them a priest of the God of Israel. Combining the new belief with their old pagan worship, they intermarried with the remnants of the captive Israelites, and thus, in process of time, they persuaded themselves that they were not very far removed from the ways and belief of the Chosen People, from whom they might by this time, by a little stretch of imagination, claim to be descended. And thus, when Cyrus released the Israelites and commanded them to build the temple in Jerusalem, the Samaritans asked an alliance with the late captives, only to receive a contemptuous refusal.

¹ 1 Esdras iv. 3.

To this day, though nearly 2,500 years have rolled by, the bitterness occasioned by that slight has not passed away. The woman whom Jesus met by the well at Sichar expressed surprise that Christ, 'being a Jew,' asked even a drink of water of her, 'a Samaritan woman'; and St. John is at pains to emphasize that the Saviour on His journey from Judea to Galilee 'was of necessity to pass through Samaria'¹—such was the ill-feeling that existed then between the two peoples. And to-day the same sense of separation insinuated by the Evangelist between Jews and Samaritans is quite as strong as it was when the messengers of the latter were still chafing under the rebuff of a refusal to participate in the erection of the temple in the Holy City.

Riding on horseback through Samaria you find unmistakable evidences of this existing among the remnants of the Samaritans in Naplouse. You find their race is as unmixed with blood foreign to their nation as it was when Jesus sat by the well; for they never intermarry with either Christian, Jew, or Moslem. They observe the mandates of the Old Law with care, and keep the feasts prescribed by Moses with scrupulous exactness, retiring once a year to celebrate the Passover on Mount Gerizim. The Samaritans lead quiet and moral lives; but owing to constant intermarriage, their number is now reduced to not more than two hundred souls. Still their proud spirit of isolation will not unbend, nor will their reluctance to mixing with outsiders grow less, until we see the final extinction of this living monument to the veracity of another episode in the Old Testament.

Among the Fellaheen of Palestine the most primitive make of garments is still adhered to. Sartorial skill is never thought of when the necessity for the purchase of new clothes arises; for the same loose inner garment and overall suit each one so well that the only anxiety the buyer has is the price and quality of the vesture, in addition to which, we may add, the need to see that the garment is neither too

¹ John iv. 4.

long nor too short. Thus it happens that Samson, as Judges xiv. 12-20 tells us, could without fear of making a mistake adopt the very convenient method of satisfying his debt of thirty coats due to the thirty young men who solved his riddle within the allotted period, by slaying thirty Ascalonites for the sake of their coats. Whatever we may think of the expediency of Samson's procedure, we need have no apprehension as to the way the dead men's garments fitted their new owners. To-day the peasant wears a long shirt as underclothing; while his outer apparel consists merely of a large mantle, reminding one of a sack slit in front with two holes for the arms, both of which garments are kept in position by a girdle, thus obviating the need of buttons or hooks—things that are by him held in supreme disdain. If, however, he be a man of position or wealth, a third garment is added to be in keeping with his dignity; and this, moreover, is supposed to be multi-coloured and of soft material—just as was the coat of divers colours presented by Jacob to his favourite son, the gift that made him an object of jealousy to his brothers.

It is quite as easy to please the peasant woman as her lord and master in matters of dress. She also wears two garments of similar shape but of different colour to those of her husband: her outer garment is striped black and red, while that of her husband is brown and white. For head-gear he wears a turban with a cloth hanging down the back of his neck as a protection against the fierce rays of the sun; while his wife wears a long veil of coarse cloth some two yards in length, which acts as a covering for the hair—precisely such as Ruth would have worn as she gleaned in the cornfields of her kinsman Booz.

It is truly interesting to view with what exactness the poorest Palestinian husbandman follows the customs referred to in Ruth, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy regarding the quantity of corn to be left over by the reapers at harvest-time for the widow and the orphan. Behind that stupid, vacant look of his, a mind, dull though it be, cherishes warmly all the old kindly laws of hospitality; and no other force moves him to observe them strictly except the fact that his fore-

fathers always did so from time immemorial, or, as the good man himself will say: 'It has been done thus from long.'

Turning to Leviticus xix. 9, 10, we find:—

When thou reapest the corn of thy land, thou shalt not cut down all that is on the face of the earth to the very ground: nor shalt thou gather the ears that remain. Neither shalt thou gather the bunches and grapes that fall down in thy vineyard, but shalt leave them to the poor and the strangers to take.

And to-day one finds that the reapers in the cornfield leave untouched a small portion of the field for the benefit of the passer-by, who, however, will merely pluck the ears and eat them on the spot, just as Christ's disciples did on the Sabbath day mentioned by St. Matthew. For the 'poor and the stranger,' who, of course, are usually the widow and orphan, the farmer is always full of pity, so much so, indeed, that he welcomes them cordially to glean after the workmen and even to 'reap' with them in case of great distress, as Booz did in the case of Ruth. He may even imitate Booz still further and command the reapers to 'let fall some of your handfuls of purpose and leave them'¹ in order that the poor widow 'may gather them without shame.'

There is one more link connecting modern Palestine with the land of the Old Testament which, though not coming under the head of customs, is worth mentioning, inasmuch as it goes to show what an excellent guide the Bible is in the Holy Land, and how vividly one seems to feel there the presence of the Lord God. After five hours' weary ride from Jerusalem to Jericho you will dismount with alacrity close to a spring of excellent water which is calculated to bring you into close touch with the days of the prophets of Israel.

When the mantle of Elias fell upon Eliseus, the latter was asked for a favour by the men of Jericho, to the inhabitants of which city, the lack of good water had been a source of continual annoyance.

Behold [they said] the situation of this city is very good,

¹ Ruth ii. 16.

as thou, my lord, seest: but the waters are very bad, and the ground barren. And he said: Bring me a new vessel, and put salt into it. And when they brought it, he went out to the spring of the waters, and cast the salt into it, and said: Thus saith the Lord: I have healed these waters, and there shall be no more in them death or barrenness. And the waters were healed unto this day, according to the word of Eliseus, which he spoke.¹

And to-day, as hot and thirsty you drink of this, one of the finest fountains in Palestine, you find the waters as sweet and wholesome as they were the hour after Eliseus had acceded to the request of the people of Jericho; and once more it is forcibly brought home to your mind how the spirit of Jehovah still hovers over the Promised Land.

If it is true—and it is true—that from the discoveries of archæologists, after years of toil and study within and without the borders of Palestine, the authenticity of Holy Scripture has drawn some of its most telling triumphs, it is also equally certain that a similar result may be justly claimed for the traces one finds there of village life connecting the Palestine of to-day with that of the people who inhabited it long before Jesus Christ trod upon its soil.

The Fellaheen of Palestine [says Robinson Lees] are the only representatives of the original inhabitants in Western Palestine, and it is chiefly in their manners and customs that we must expect to find the Bible mirrored in the people. Their very existence is in itself a sufficient confirmation of Holy Writ; and, though we may consider that God has wonderfully preserved the country and its inhabitants to be witnesses for the truth of His word to the present generation, yet we are to exercise our knowledge and judgment as in everything else; and the more carefully the Bible is studied in the land in which it was written, where the manners and customs are the same, and where the descriptions of dress and modes of life are applicable to the people now, the more clearly do we recognize the grandeur of God's great scheme of redemption worked out to the end, to the great sacrifice offered once for all.

But it is not on the highways beaten by the pilgrim or

¹ 4 Kings ii. 19-22.

tourist that the enquirer will see these similarities, nor in the flying visit usually paid to Palestine nowadays by Westerns; generally speaking, only away in the quiet villages and on the brown hillsides, can those evidences of Holy Scripture be discerned—evidences which, while strengthening his faith, leads him back in mind to the days when the spirit of Jehovah first passed over the land.

J. P. CONRY.

THREE IRISH HYMNS

THE first and second of the following hymns were first published by Professor Kuno Meyer in *Archiv. für Celtische Lexikographie*, Band iii. 231-2. They have not, so far as I know, been translated before. The third is taken from the same author's *Selections from Early Irish Poetry*, page 1. It has been translated by him in his *Ancient Irish Poetry*,¹ page 28; and he remarks that, though ascribed to St. Patrick, it cannot be older than the tenth century. The version given below has been made independently.

I.²

I.

Δ Κοιμθε βαίθ,
 Δ Ρί να ρίγ,
 Δ ατάρ ιονμαιν
 αηέρ[e] οίμ.

2.

ηά ρυccam ανοην³
 ναc ρεαcαθ linn.
 ηά ραgbum ταιι
 πέιν αρ αρ cinn.

¹ This splendid volume contains also a translation of the poem published in the February number of the I. E. RECORD, supra. pp. 172-7. When it was printed off the following points were noted by Dr. Osborn Bergin: (1) That Strachan's correction in stanza 4 does not give the regular number of syllables, either in the short line or in the ending, the true reading being *conom-biúse* rhyming with *Iússe*; (2) that *ollaighe*, untranslated in stanza 11, should be analysed *oll-óige*, 'great guest' (this conjecture is supported by the version of Meyer, who had access to other manuscript copies); (3) that stanza 3 might be translated 'O merciful forgiving one . . . pray with us to the just King.' Meyer does not translate stanza 8. He takes *oirbe*, stanza 10, to be = *airbe*, 'track,' and this is supported by the rhyme; see also the reading of Laud 615, s.v. *árad*, Contribb.

² The metre is *Trian randaigechta móire* (*Ir. Text.* iii. 84), i.e., short lines with four syllables and a monosyllabic ending. The second and fourth short lines rhyme. Stanza 1 seems to show a slight irregularity if *ionmain* be not regarded as *ion-main*. Professor Dr. Bergin, to whose kindness I am indebted for some very useful notes, says that *ionmain* cannot be right, as a monosyllable with long vowel is required.

³ This line has an extra syllable. Dr. Bergin would read first sing. throughout the quatrain: *rucc, limm, faghba, ar mo chinn*.

3.

Ἐρεβλαῖε νοργλαν¹
 no-γ-ταβαῖρ οὐν,
 Δ μαῖε Ὁέ βί,
 Δ Ρί να ρῦν.

4.

Ἠί ραξβα ἀρ η-εἰλλ
 demon οὐβ οὐονη,
 ἰ μαῖξ ἰ τοῖξ²
 Ἠο-η-ξεῖβ ροτ εὐομμ.³

TRANSLATION.

I.

I.

O gentle Lord,
 O King of kings,
 O dear Father,
 Have mercy on me.

2.

May we not bring over
 Any sin with us,
 May we not find beyond
 Pain before us.

3.

⁴Tribulation which purifies us
 Give to us,
 O Son of the Living God,
 O King of mysteries.

¹ Substituted for *noarglana*, which is corrupt and unmetrical. The correct reading is doubtful. Dr. Bergin suggests *no-γ-glan* or *n-ar-glan* with M. Ir. form of the infix and shift of conjugation for O. Ir. *no-n-glana* (?). This gives the monosyllabic ending.

² 'Read τοῖξ . . . ηο-η-ξεῖβ, required by metre.'—Dr. Bergin.

³ Meyer's correction of *coim*, which does not rhyme.

⁴ According to Dr. Bergin's suggestion.

4.

May the black strong¹ devil
 Not take us unguarded,²
 Without, within,
 Take us under your protection.

II.³

I.

Tucc dam, a Dé mór,
 For bit cé, ní cé,
 Ar pianu na plás
 tonna díana dé.

2.

Do-m-roidéod for míc
 roidec ná rop raic⁴
 Co roic m'óenar moé
 ar zac mbæzol mbraic.

3.

Ucán, a Éiric cáid,
 san rruicán dom grúaid
 Feib tucair⁵ in linn
 dom banórcáil timm trúaid.

4.

Ucán, ar zac n-alc
 san rruicán dar m'úct,
 Cu rob nige anóct
 dom éirde ir dom éurp.

¹ Cf. *go donn dána*, 'brave and bold.' Other meanings of *donn* do not suit here.

² 'eill, modern *faill* (?), a common synonym of *boegal* in the sense of "unguarded state"; cf. *ar ráimic . . . eill ropna comertib*, Hugh Roe, 18, 23; *ni n bó roðainz uorom ell nó baogal oraccbáil*, *F.M.* vi. 1960; *fuam an iúrcir ell 7 elang a pporcoimétt uí néill*, *ib.* 2224; *Rogab eill dona Mirmedondaib sech cach*, *Ir. Text.* ii. p. 48, l. 1513, mistranslated by Stokes.—Dr. Bergin.

³ Metre, *Lethrandaiagecht mór* (*Ir. Text.* iii. 81), i.e., short lines of five syllables with monosyllabic ending. The second and fourth short lines rhyme as in the preceding.

⁴ Corrected from *saith* (Meyer).

⁵ Corrected from *tucus* (Meyer).

5.

Δρ ζαé renóir rruir
 φορράζαιβ α τοιό,
 Δρ το ρίγι ρείλ,
 Δρ το ééimm Δρ ερσιό.

6.

Δρ εαé óin ρο-óí
 α éin Δρ βιé éé,
 Mo élóine, α Dé βι,
 co ρο-óóine mé.

7.

Δρ το μαίε co μόρ,
 Δρ το ρλαίε cen léh,
 Co ηορυνh, co húaín
 tue óam τοβαρ óéη.

8.

Α mo οίτε, α Dé,
 Δm¹ éρσοι το éρú
 Déαηα óam, α Dé,
 cé ρο-βέηα Δé[ε] tú?

TRANSLATION.

II.

I.

Give to me, O great God,
 On this world, I shall not conceal it,
 Strong waves of tears
 Against pains of torments.

2.

Let a vessel which will be good
 Come to me at a race,
 That I may come early alone
 Past every danger of treachery.

¹ Read *im*.

3.

Alas, O Holy Christ,
 There is no stream to my cheek,
 As you gave the flood
 To the timorous wretched woman.¹

4.

Alas to every member
 That there is no stream on my breast
 That it may be a washing to-night
 To my heart and my body.

5.

By every wise ancient
 Who abandoned his wealth,
 By Thy bright kingdom,
 By Thy going on the cross.

6.

By every one who wept
 His sin in this world,
 May I lament,
 O Living God, my perversity.

7.

By Thy great goodness,
 By Thy kingdom without sorrow,
 Quickly in time²
 Give me a well of tears.

8.

O my Love, my God,
 Into my heart for blood
 Who shall give me tears,
 O God, but You.

¹ i.e., Mary Magdalen.

² 'co huain—cf. *ar laeich ar ngadhair co huain ac faghail um an caemhchluain*, Acall. 502. O'Grady renders "at their discretion"; Stokes, "leisurely."—Dr. Bergin.

III.¹

PATRAIC DIXIT.

I.

Τὸρροματ το νόιβ-αγγελῶν
 Δ Ἐπίστ μαίκε Θε βί
 Δρ σοτλιο, Δρ συμπαυο,
 Δρ ιερωο σο υί.

2.

Fírrí fíra foillrígét
 'n-ár coúltaib dún,
 Δ ἀποφλαίτ inna n-uile
 Δ ruire na rún.

3.

Ná míllet Δρ συμπαυο,
 Δρ σοτλιο λαίνο úáτ
 Demna, Δρκόβιτ, Διτομίλλιο,
 Δρλίγγι σο n-úáτ.

4.

Rop éráibdeé Δρ φριτάιρε,
 Δρ μοναρ, Δρ μοο,
 Δρ σοτλιο, Δρ συμπαυο
 cen teíbuo, cen τορ.

TRANSLATION.

III.

I.

O Christ, Son of the living God,
 May Thy holy angels attend
 Our sleep, our rest,
 Our bed with beauty.

2.

May they show true visions
 In our sleep to us,
 O High-prince of all,
 O Lord of mysteries.

¹ Metre, *Cró cummaisc etiv casbairdni ocus lethrandasgecht* (*Ir. Text.* iii. 83) described above, p. 172.

3.

Let not devils, evil, destruction,
Nor dreadful visions
Destroy our rest,
Our pleasant quick sleep,

4.

May our watching be holy,
Our deed, our act ;
Our sleep, our rest,
Without interruption, without fear.

PAUL WALSH.

Notes and Queries

THEOLOGY

THE 'TABLET'S' CONSOLATION

IT would be a pity not to quote the following paragraph from the *Tablet* of April 8:—

If the nuns whose consciences were troubled about the use of the return halves of railway tickets were not wholly solaced—as no doubt they were—by the 'authoritative view' given in the *Tablet*, there is fresh cause for comfort in the report of an unsuccessful action taken by a railway company. We quote from the *Daily Chronicle*: 'Mr. Schiller, for the railway company, explained that a Mr. Williams wished to travel from Oxford to Witney, and, failing to take a ticket at the booking office, bought an excess slip from the travelling collector. Instead of returning by rail he drove back and gave the return half of the excess slip to a Mr. Bunker, who travelled with it. The inspector recognized the ticket, and eventually both men were summoned: the first for unlawfully transferring the ticket, and the second for travelling with intent to defraud the company. The magistrates, however, held that both men had acted in ignorance and without intent to defraud, and dismissed the summons. The Lord Chief Justice said it was rough on Bunker, who had had the ticket given him, and thought his fare had been paid. Mr. Justice Bray: Do you suggest that the mere transfer is illegal? Mr. Schiller: The by-law says so. Their lordships said that, seeing that the magistrates had decided that the defendants had acted without unlawful intent, they could not allow the appeal, which was accordingly dismissed with costs.'

The reader will see that the two men were acquitted of a *criminal offence* because it was proved that they 'had acted in *ignorance* and without *intent* to defraud.' The right of the railway company to impose the non-transferable condition of the contract was not questioned, and was recognized by the accepted plea of *ignorance* and by the statement of the Lord Chief Justice that Bunker

'thought his fare had been paid.' In the same way a man who, thinking that his fare had been paid, travelled without a ticket could not be charged with the criminal offence of travelling with intent to defraud the company; but only a person devoid of theological training would conclude therefrom that there is no obligation in conscience to pay the just fare.¹

The *Tablet* thinks that it will afford great consolation to its followers to know that ignorance is a sufficient plea against the charge of having committed the criminal offence of travelling with the intention of defrauding the railway company. It would be more to the point if the *Tablet* could show that they are not bound to pay the just fare of which they, however ignorantly, have defrauded the company. Still it is sad that its Rev. Ethiopian supporter, whose sorry plight was narrated in the *Tablet* of April 8 by 'Frank Day,' was not able by a plea of ignorance to escape the fine of '£5 or ten days' imprisonment' imposed for the transference of the return half of a railway ticket which was 'not transferable.'

The Editor of the *Tablet* has not considered it his duty to quote for his readers the law of the land as laid down by Lord Chief Justice Cockburn in the High Court of England.² Of course, ignorance has its own 'comfort,' but honest people prefer to know the truth. The 'authoritative decision' of the *Tablet* of January 21 has now, we notice, been reduced in rank to an 'authoritative view.' This, however, is not enough. For a conscientious publicist, who has made a mistake in ethical teaching, there is nothing for it but to take the manly course of acknowledging and correcting the error. This, of course, is on the hypothesis that he is unable to meet the arguments against him;³ a task for which, to say the least, the Editor of the *Tablet* has not shown any eagerness.

¹ 'Where a person travels without a ticket, the fare may be recovered by the company quite irrespective of his liability to punishment for fraud (Regulation of Railways Act, 1889, s. 5 (4)).'—Disney, *Carriage by Railway*, p. 212.

² I. E. RECORD, February, p. 204.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 203, 204.

**POWER OF DISPENSING FROM CLANDESTINITY IN
'PERICULO MORTIS'**

REV. DEAR SIR,—Can the priest who assists at a marriage in accordance with Article VII. of the Decree *Ne Temere* dispense from the impediment of clandestinity, so that, if occasion demands, he can celebrate the marriage without the presence of the two witnesses? The Decree of the S. Congregation of the Discipline of the Sacraments, May 18, 1909, says that the priest can dispense from *all* impediments of the ecclesiastical law except priesthood and lawful affinity in the direct line.

M.

The part of the Decree of May 18, 1909, on which the solution of this practical question depends is the following :—

Re mature perpensa. . . Sanctitas Sua . . . declarare dignata est ac decernere, quemlibet sacerdotem, qui ad normam art. VII. decreti *Ne Temere*, imminente mortis periculo, ubi parochus vel loci Ordinarius vel sacerdos ab alterutro delegatus haberi nequeat, coram duobus testibus matrimonio adsistere valide ac licite potest, in iisdem rerum adjunctis dispensare quoque posse super impedimentis omnibus, etiam publicis, matrimonium jure ecclesiastico dirimentibus, exceptis sacro presbyteratus ordine et affinitate lineae rectae ex copula licita.

Does the phrase 'in iisdem rerum adjunctis dispensare quoque posse super impedimentis omnibus' include the power to dispense from clandestinity so far as the witnesses are concerned when there is a sufficient reason for so doing?

There are two opinions amongst authorities on this point. Fathers Ferreres¹ and Beson² hold that the power is given to grant the dispensation from clandestinity, because the phrase is universal ('super impedimentis omnibus') outside the cases of priesthood and lawful affinity in the direct line. Father Lehmkuhl,³ on the other hand, says that clandestinity is not included amongst the impediments for which dispensing power is granted by the Decree, since it is expressly stated that two witnesses must be present ('coram duobus testibus . . . in iisdem rerum ad-

¹ *Ra. on. y Fd.*, July, 1909.

² *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, August, 1909.

³ *Theologia Moralit*, nn. 891, 1015, 2.

junctis'). He admits, however, that in case of extreme spiritual need it is probably that by *epieikeia* the necessity of having the two witnesses ceases.

In view of this conflict between experts, the opinion of Fathers Ferreres and Beson can be regarded as probable and safe in practice until an authoritative decision emanates from the Holy See. Hence, in practice, the assisting priest can validly grant the dispensation when there is sufficient reason.

CASES OF RESERVATION

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you kindly answer the following questions in the May number of the I. E. RECORD:—

(1) Having committed a sin which is reserved in his own diocese, a person goes on business to a strange diocese where the sin is not reserved, and happens to meet there his own parish priest. Can the latter absolve from the reserved sin?

(2) Having committed a sin which is not reserved in his own diocese, a person goes to a strange diocese where the sin is reserved, and meets there his own parish priest. Can the latter absolve from the sin?

(3) The sin was committed before the reservation was imposed, and the penitent goes to confession after the reservation was imposed. Can an ordinary confessor give absolution?

(4) The sin was committed while the reservation was in existence, and the penitent goes to confession after the reservation was removed in the diocesan synod. Can an ordinary confessor give absolution?

Q.

(1) The parish priest cannot, without special faculties, absolve from the sin which is reserved in his and the penitent's diocese, because the jurisdiction of the parish priest is the jurisdiction of his diocese and is limited by the reservation of his Bishop.¹

(2) The parish priest can absolve from the sin which is not reserved in his and the penitent's diocese, since his jurisdiction over his subject is not limited by any reservation of his Bishop.²

¹ Gennari, *Quistioni Theologico-Morali*, p. 684.

² Lugo, *De Sac. Poen.*, D. xx, n. 73.

(3) Though the sin was not reserved when it was committed, it is reserved when it is confessed, and, consequently, an ordinary confessor cannot *per se* give absolution. The penitent, however, is in the same condition as a person who was in ignorance of the reservation when he committed the reserved sin, and the principles which hold in regard to ignorance apply. Hence, *per accidens*, on account of a probable opinion, an ordinary confessor can give absolution unless the Bishop has stated that in his diocese ignorance does not excuse. Moreover, if the Bishop stated that the reservation was not retrospective, an ordinary confessor could give absolution; and also if the confession were begun before the reservation was imposed.¹

(4) An ordinary confessor can absolve from a sin which is not reserved at the time when he actually exercises his jurisdiction, because he is then under no limitation.

RESTITUTION TO AN INSURANCE COMPANY

REV. DEAR SIR,—May I be allowed to submit to you the following case of conscience:—

John is living in a town which is nothing but a hotbed of Protestantism. Catholics are almost persecuted; many have been forced to leave the place. John wishes through discouragement to move away; but finds it almost impossible to sell his house and property. Anxious to get away he sets the house on fire and receives from the insurance company the full amount of the insurance policy, \$1500.00.

I. Is John bound to make restitution? If so; to whom?

II. May John retain the amount of \$200.00 paid to the insurance company for 'premiums'?

Is it not a fact that insurance companies reinsure their risks, and charge a higher premium to the policy-holders, to cover cases similar to the one referred to in this letter?

Kindly answer through the pages of the I. E. RECORD. With sincere thanks, I remain, yours in Christ,

J. R. A.

I. John is bound to make restitution, because he de-

¹ D'Annibale, i. 341; Lugo, viii. Lib. i., Dub. xxv.

frauded the insurance company by his unjust action. Ordinarily, the restitution is to be made to the company with which he insured, but he is bound, if he can do so without incurring serious risk, to give such information as will enable the company to make a refund of the amount which it received from any other company. He may, however, give this amount directly to the other company, if he is able to find out how far it has been injured by his unjust action.

II. John may not retain the premiums already paid, because he got value for the amount by the security which he received in return. Undoubtedly, in fixing the premium, insurance companies take into account the risks which they run by reason of losses suffered through fraud, but it is quite reasonable that they should do so since otherwise they could not successfully carry on their business, and common estimation acknowledges their right so to act. Of course, if, taking all such risks into account, the companies were to impose too high a rate, they would be guilty of injustice, and a proportionate amount of the premiums could be retained. But it must be proved in individual cases that too high a premium has been paid; the mere fact that account has been taken of these risks does not prove that the premium was unjust.

J. M. HARTY.

CANON LAW

THE ROMAN CONGREGATIONS AND CERTAIN CONFRATERNITIES

REV. DEAR SIR,—To which of the Roman Congregations must a priest have recourse in regard to matters connected with the Confraternity of the Holy Rosary or the Apostleship of Prayer? I have heard various opinions expressed, but am myself of the opinion that petitions should be sent to the Congregation for the Affairs of Religious Communities. The associations mentioned have always been, and are, closely connected with the

religious Orders, and should therefore, to my mind, be subject to the same Congregation as the religious Orders themselves. Kindly let me have your opinion.

RELIGIOSUS.

The matter must be decided according to the regulations of the Constitution *Sapienti Consilio*, dated June 29, 1908, and taking effect from the following November 3. The document effected a complete reform of the Roman Curia, and determined for the future the authority and jurisdiction of the various Congregations it established or confirmed.

We find (sec. i. par. 5, n. 1) that the Congregation for Religious' Affairs has jurisdiction not merely over religious of both sexes with solemn or simple vows, or others who, without any vows, live a community life like that of religious, but also over the 'third (secular) orders.'¹ Now some Confraternities—that of the Sacred Heart, for example—are occasionally referred to as 'third orders,' though in reality they are nothing of the kind. And, as our correspondent remarks, there are other associations that have been so closely connected with one or other of the religious Orders as to have at first sight some claim to similarity of treatment. Should the 'tertii ordines saeculares' of the Decree be taken in a sufficiently wide sense to include all these? We think not. One of the main objects of the Decree was to put an end to the inconvenience of having several Congregations simultaneously competent in regard to the same matters. And we see from a previous paragraph (par. 4, n. 2) that jurisdiction had already been conferred on the Congregation of the Council over all manner of pious 'unions' and 'sodalities.'² The conclusion would, therefore, seem to be that the term 'third orders' should be taken in a strict sense, and that confraternities and other

¹ 'Haec Sacra Congregatio iudicium sibi vindicat de iis tantum quae ad Sodales religiosos utriusque sexus tum solemnibus, tum simplicibus votis adstrictos, et ad eos qui, quamvis sine votis, in communi tamen vitam agunt more religiosorum, itemque ad tertios ordines saeculares, in universum pertinent.'

² 'Quamobrem ipsius (Sacrae Congregationis Concilii) est . . . moderari . . . quae pias Sodalitates, pias uniones, . . . aliaque hujusmodi attingunt.'

associations of the kind, no matter how close their connection with the religious Orders, are subject to the control of the Congregation of the Council, unless they have all the canonical qualifications of a 'third order' properly so called.

We do not agree, therefore, with 'Religiosus' that the Confraternity of the Rosary and the Association of the Apostleship of Prayer, associated with the Dominican and Jesuit Orders respectively, are subject to the Congregation for Religious' Affairs. And we may quote in support of our view an answer given on December 9, 1909, by the Consistorial Congregation and confirmed on the following day by His Holiness. There is no mention made of any particular confraternity, but the general terms cover the case:—

Proposito dubio, 'utrum competentia super confraternitates a Constitutione *Sapientis Consilio* tributa Sacrae Congregationi Concilii se extendat quoque ad confraternitates et pias uniones quae dependent ab Ordinibus et congregationibus religiosis, vel erectae sunt in eorum ecclesiis seu domibus; an potius haec reservata sit Sacrae Congregationi de Religiosis. Emi. Patres S. Cong. Consistorialis, praehabito consultoris voto, in generalibus comitiis diei 9 Decembris 1909 respondendum censuerunt: *Affirmative ad primam partem, negative ad secundam.*¹

The Congregation of the Council, then, has exclusive control over pious confraternities, even though dependent on the religious Orders or erected in their churches. And the two associations mentioned are clearly included.

CRANIOTOMY AND EXCOMMUNICATION

REV. DEAR SIR,—Is the excommunication 'contra procurantes abortum,' reserved to the Ordinary in the Constitution *Apostolicae Sedis*, incurred by a doctor who practises craniotomy? I was always under the impression that it was not, until I heard the matter discussed recently.

PRESBYTER.

For practical purposes 'Presbyter's' impression was quite correct, and he may retain it no matter what dis-

¹ *Acta Apost. Sedis*, v. i. p. 814.

cussions he has heard. In theory there is some slight doubt, for a few theologians extend the censure to the case mentioned on the ground that both crimes are equally opposed to the purpose the legislator had in view and are attended by practically the same results. But the great majority of authorities hold the opposite view, inasmuch as craniotomy and abortion are two specifically different offences and have been always treated as such by writers on theology and canon law. Whether the crime be as great in one case as the other is altogether outside the question, the real point being that it is not precisely *the* crime contemplated in the penal legislation. 'Odia sunt restringenda.'¹

In practice, therefore, there need be no anxiety. The censure, at most, is doubtful, and is, therefore, not incurred. The offence is, of course, a mortal sin, but any ordinary confessor can absolve on the usual conditions.

TESTIMONIAL LETTERS FOR ORDINATION—SOME ROMAN DECISIONS

REV. DEAR SIR,—Please state what are the regulations at present in force regarding testimonial letters for ordination. My attention has been directed to two Decrees of the Congregation of the Council (1893 and 1895), which seem to state that three months' residence in another diocese entails the necessity of applying for testimonial letters to the Ordinary of the place. Whether these are decisive or of general application I have not been able to discover.

ADMINISTRATOR.

Making allowance for the diversity of opinion that is bound to arise in matters of this kind when there has been no definite general decision, it may be said that the unanimous teaching of canonists now is that there is no obliga-

¹ Cf. Genicot, *Theol. Moral. Instit.*, ii. 690; Dr. Prummer in the *Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift* (1910, iii.), etc. See the *N. R. Théologique*, t. 42, n. 9-10, p. 579. Haine is quoted: 'Neque huc (ad abortum) pertinet craniotomia seu embriotomia, quia differt ab abortu nedum in terminis, ut per se liquet, sed etiam in re, cum non sit ejectio foetus sed potius occisio foetus, quam consequitur cadaveris ejectio. Aliunde in poenalibus non valet argumentum a pari nec imo a fortiori.'

tion to apply for or obtain testimonial letters unless the ordinand has lived for at least six months in another diocese : the same rule, in other words, holds as governs the proclamation of banns.¹ If he has spent that time in several dioceses he will be obliged to apply to the Ordinary of each. Of course it is quite possible that a canonical impediment may be contracted in a much shorter space of time, but general laws take into account only what is usual or probable, not what is physically possible. Otherwise there would be an obligation to appeal to every Bishop in whose diocese the candidate had ever spent a day or even less.

The two Decrees which 'Administrator' mentions—and several others of a similar description²—are of no practical importance for this country, for they refer to a class of candidates with which we have no concern—clerics, namely, who have undergone a course of military training. This is evident from the questions put and the answers given. To quote the second mentioned by our correspondent. On January 26, 1895, the following reply was given to the Bishop of Urgel, in Spain :—

Pro clericis ordinandis jam militiae addictis, sub poena a Const. *Apostolicae Sedis* comminata, requiri litteras testimoniales Ordinarii, in cujus dioecesi per trimestre commorati fuerint, et, quatenus Ordinarii litterae plenum testimonium non reddant, episcopus, obtenta ad hoc facultate ab Apostolica Sede, provideat per juramentum suppletorium.²

The Decrees clearly leave the case of the ordinary candidate just as it was. And even in regard to the particular class they do affect, it may be questioned whether they establish a general law. For, according to the Bull *Immensa* of Sixtus V. the decisions of the Congregation of the Council are 'authentic interpretations' of law only when the matter decided has been referred to the Sovereign Pontiff. And in none of the Decrees referred to is there any indication that His Holiness confirmed the decision.

¹ Cf. Gasparri, *De Ordin.*, p. 730 ; Bucceroni, Pennacchi, d'Annibale, and Piat, *In Const. Apost. Sedis*, pp. 67, app. 44, 114, and 297, respectively ; Santi, *De temp. ordin.*, p. 147 ; Many, *De Sacra Ordin.*, p. 311, etc.

² *A. S. Sedis*, xxviii. 49. Cf. *ibid.*, xxiii. 40 ; xxv. 638 ; xxvi. 431, etc.

Though our correspondent's opening request is rather general, we presume this is the only point he really wants discussed.

PASSING FROM ONE ORDER TO ANOTHER

REV. DEAR SIR,—In connexion with the Decree forbidding the admission of certain postulants into religious Orders and Congregations, you mentioned, in the March number of the I. E. RECORD, the canonical privilege of passing from an Order to a stricter one. Have all religious got this privilege, and is the consent of the Holy See required? I have had experience of a case lately in which the superior refused to allow a subject to leave, alleging that permission from Rome was required. There are some Orders, I know, that claim a special privilege of prohibiting their members from joining any other Order however strict, but the Congregation I speak of is certainly not among the number. Is there any law on the subject?

CHAPLAIN.

The state of the case seems to be this. For many centuries members of the Regular Orders (and it was only of them there was question at the time) enjoyed fully the privilege of passing to a more strict Order. The superior was bound to give his consent, and no appeal to Rome was necessary. But, though no express general law has been passed to the contrary, the custom for a long time has been in the opposite direction and is regarded now as having in many cases the force of law. Purely diocesan Congregations, it is true, still remain under the control of the Bishop, and, whether there is question of joining another Congregation or an Order properly so called, the Bishop may grant the required permission without having recourse to any higher authority. But in regard to other Orders and Congregations approved by the Holy See, the almost universal custom—and, some would say, the law—is to apply for permission to the Apostolic See.

The ancient law affecting strict regulars is laid down in a passage of the Decretals:—

Sicut subditus a praelato cum humilitate et puritate debet transeundi licentiam postulare, ne bonum obedientiae contemnere

videatur, sic profecto praeltaus subdito sine difficultate et pravitare qualibet debet transeundi licentiam indulgere ne videatur propositum impedire divinitus inspiratum.¹

The privilege was understood as applying only to those who sought admission to a stricter Order and was subject to various limitations: the candidate, for instance, could not exercise it unless he had a sufficiently good reason to urge in favour of the change, unless, moreover, he could carry out his purpose without seriously injuring the institution he proposed to leave, and was quite prepared to return in case his profession in the other Order did not, for any reason, follow in the ordinary course.²

But whatever the formal prescriptions of law, the practice has been so much in favour of an appeal to Rome that we find Ferraris making this statement: 'Regulares professi non possunt ad aliam religionem etiam strictiorem transire sine licentia Sanctae Sedis';³ and Wernz summing up the situation as follows:—

Ex disciplina nunc vigente, de stylo Curiae Romanae nullus regularis ad aliam religionem etiam arctiorem transire potest, nisi petita et obtenta licentia Apostolicae Sedis. Quod indultum apostolicum certissime requiritur si monialis votorum solemnium in alium conventum velit transire.⁴

Benedict XIV. speaks of the practice of having recourse to Rome, but, except in the case of Orders that enjoy the special privilege mentioned by our correspondent, does not regard it apparently as having the force of a strict law.⁵ That permission from Rome is, however, at the present day, no mere formality is clear from the fact that it is occasionally refused, and the applicants commanded to remain in the Order in which they have been professed, even when the other is unquestionably more strict.⁶

¹ Cap. *Licet*, 18, *De Regular.* (iii. 31).

² Cf. Suarez, *De Virt. et Stat. Relig.*, t. 8, l. 3, c. 8; Schmalz., l. 3, t. 31, n. 225; Bouix, *De jure Regular.*, t. 2, p. 492, etc.

³ *Biblioth.*, art. 'Transitus.'

⁴ *Jus. Decret.*, iii. 679.; cf. De Angelis in tit. 31, l. 3, decr. n. 14.

⁵ *Const. Ex quo*, 17.

⁶ e.g., the Avila Carmelites.

As for Congregations with simple vows, their members may elect to join another Congregation or a strict Order. In the former case it would seem that permission from Rome is required just as much as in the case of the regulars. Wernz states : ' Imo vel ipsae moniales votorum simplicium, quae in uno instituto religioso professionem perpetuam vel temporaneam emiserunt, sine venia Sedis Apostolicae non possunt in alia congregatione religiosa recipi.'¹ The new *Normae*, issued on June 28, 1901, forbid institutions with simple vows to accept postulants already bound by vow to another Order.² And though these regulations have not the force of law, and are not retrospective, they indicate the principles on which the Roman See will in future proceed in approving Congregations, and give a clue to the general policy that Rome favours.

If the members wish to join a strict Order, the indications are not quite so clear, and it may perhaps be fairly held that permission from Rome is not, strictly speaking, required. Father Veermersch, S. J., a great authority on these matters, denies the need of any such permission when the interests of the Congregation are not injuriously affected.³ But there is no doubt that, even in this case, an application to the Roman See would be more in harmony with the present system of discipline.

And in all cases it must be remembered that it is no longer open to a member of any Order or Congregation to procure a dispensation from his or her vows in order to enter another Order afterwards. The fact of procuring such a dispensation is now a canonical impediment to admission into any Order or Congregation whatever.⁴

The superior, therefore, of whom ' Chaplain ' speaks was probably taking the correct and prudent course. In any particular case the presumption is in favour of an appeal to Rome, unless the circumstances make it quite clear that neither the law nor the custom affect the case and render

¹ *loc cit.*, cf. Battandier, *Guide Canonique*, pp. 51 sqq.

² Art. 61.

³ *De reorg. Inst. et Pers.* i. 321.

⁴ See I. E. RECORD, March, 1910.

the application necessary. And if this be true of those who wish to join a stricter Order or Congregation, it is true *a fortiori* of those who seek admission into one of equal or less strict observance.¹

M. J. O'DONNELL.

LITURGY

INSCRIPTION OF NAMES IN SCAPULAR CONFRATERNITIES

REV. DEAR SIR,—In reference to your very useful remarks on page 418 of last issue, I should like to ask: Would you not draw some distinction between being enrolled in the *Scapular* and in the *Confraternity* thereof? A 'Confraternity' or 'Sodality,' by the very force of words, implies a meeting together, an association of certain people. But when you are enrolled in the *Brown Scapular*, just as in the case of the *Red*, for instance, you have no intention of joining any society publicly, but of acting privately. Again, in my diocese there is no Carmelite house; if, therefore, I send 100 names or more to the nearest branch, why should the Fathers be put to the trouble of inscribing them? If every parish priest so acted no register ever manufactured would hold these millions of names, for nearly every one is enrolled nowadays.

With regard to the new 'medal-scapulars,' now so widely being adopted. They are said to require a blessing by a priest. Suppose persons neglect to obtain this blessing, will that *invalidate* them? Or, having got the medal blessed and losing it, will the second also require the blessing? Going by analogy, I should answer 'No' in both cases. It is only a *substitute*, and under the old system it was not required—once enrolled always enrolled therefore.

SCAPULARIAN.

Our esteemed correspondent raises an interesting point in regard to Scapular Confraternities. Is there any spiritual advantage or indulgence attached to the wearing of the Scapular itself, independently of membership in the particular association with which it is connected? No doubt, as he states, the idea of a Confraternity, in popular estimation

¹ Council of Trent, Sess. 25, c. 19, *De Regular.*; Benedict XIV., Const. *Pastor Bonus* (A.D. 1744); Ojetti, *Synopsis*, art. 'Transitus,' etc.

at all events, is associated with a group of persons who meet together from time to time for certain ends or aims. Now, as the idea is scarcely realized in the Rosary Sodalities, it might seem that they lack the essentials of true societies, and, therefore, that too much importance may be given to the necessity of a visible connexion with them. In reply it may be said that—prescinding from the formalities of erection and government—all that is of the essence of a true society is that (a) there should be a number of persons, (b) united together by some external bond of union, (c) for a definite purpose. The word implies all this but scarcely anything more. In secular Sodalities, indeed, the objects desired cannot, as a rule, be attained without meetings and discussions on the part either of the whole body or at least of a section. But in religious societies, where the chief end in view is the spiritual welfare of living or deceased members, the objects may be secured by the co-operation of the members in private. This is the meaning of being *enrolled*. All must intend to promote the common good of the association, and if they have this intention it is enough for all practical purposes. Whatever, in the present instance, may be said of the speculative question, there is no doubt that for the three Scapulars mentioned in a former issue—that is, the Scapulars of Mount Carmel, the Blessed Trinity, and the Seven Dolours—membership in the corresponding Confraternities is absolutely necessary, so that without it no indulgence whatsoever can be gained. This is quite clear from the *formula* for imposing the Scapulars where the blessing is inseparable from the reception into the association. Nor is the reason far to seek. In the beginning the privileges of these Scapulars were confined to members of the respective Orders. Then after a time the indulgences were extended by the Holy See to the faithful on the condition that they connected themselves by this visible badge with the Order concerned. There are, of course, other Scapulars for which no such connexion is necessary, and by which indulgences may be gained by saying certain prayers, or even by the very act of wearing without any other requirement.

As to the difficulties of inscribing the names in the case of Scapular Sodalties, the real trouble appears to be exaggerated. If there is a canonically erected branch of any Confraternity in the district or parish (and all that is required to have this is the sanction of the Bishop and faculties from the General of the Order) receptions may be held a few times each year, and on these occasions the Director, if he cannot do it himself, may authorize some other competent person to enter the names of those admitted on the register. When the names have to be sent away, they may be entered on a few sheets of foolscap as already explained, and forwarded at intervals to the proper quarters. After this the Fathers may be trusted to deal with them in the most convenient and least troublesome manner. They need not necessarily be transcribed into a common book. It would seem to be sufficient if all the lists were strung together and kept in the archives of the convent where such documents may be safely and securely stored.

About the 'Medal-Scapulars,' the medal must be blessed in both cases.¹ What is permitted as a substitute for the Scapular is not the medal as such but a medal that has been *blessed* by a priest who is authorized to do so in accordance with the explanation already given.²

THE BLUE SCAPULAR

In the April issue of the I. E. RECORD (page 420), it was stated that when faculties for blessing the Blue Scapular are obtained from the General of the Theatines, he usually, since 1894, requires to have the names enrolled. But when the faculties are obtained from any other source and when inscription of the names is not insisted on, then some appear to think that, pending a decision of the Holy See, the names need not necessarily be inscribed to gain the indulgences.

¹ Cf. *Eph. Lit.*, 1911, p. 169.

² Cf. I. E. RECORD, March, 1911.

PRIVATE 'REQUIEM' MASSES

REV. DEAR SIR,—Will you please say in next number of the I. E. RECORD how many low Masses *de Requie* are now allowed on simple doubles or doubles major. There seems that some confusion has arisen on account of Decrees to be found in the introductory pages of the *Ordo*. It appears to me that only one *Requiem* Low Mass can be celebrated on a double—*presente cadavere*—unless a solemn Requiem Mass or a *Missa Cantata* is to follow.—Sincerely yours,

SACERDOS.

In accordance with prevailing legislation private *Requiem* Masses may be said in the following circumstances:—

1°. With the exception of Sundays, Holydays of obligation, Doubles of the First Class and days that exclude them, private Masses for the Dead may be said in Churches and Public Oratories on the day of the death or burial, or any intervening day, provided that (a) the remains are physically or morally present, (b) the Solemn Exequial Mass is held and (c) the Masses are offered up for the deceased. It is understood that here private Masses can be said only on the day of the Exequial service unless the rite otherwise permits them.¹

2°. In Semipublic and Private Oratories private *Requiem* Masses may be said under above conditions but without the Exequial Mass. Where the Oratory is purely private or domestic the Masses may be said on all days from death to burial, as long as the remains are present in the house of which the Oratory forms part; but where the Oratory is not such, as in the case of Communities and Institutions, then the *Requiem* Mass is permitted only on some *one* day.²

3°. In Sepulchral Chapels and Oratories *Requiem* Masses may be celebrated on days not occupied by Sundays, Holydays, Privileged Octaves, Ferials, Vigils, Doubles of the Second Class or their equivalents.

4°. Finally, where the family of a deceased person is so poor as not to be able to afford the expenses of a Solemn

¹ Decr. S.R.C., nn. 3903, 3944, etc.

² S. R. C. Decr., 3 Ap., 1900; 10 Nov., 1906.

Requiem Mass, a private Mass is permitted in exactly the same circumstances as the ordinary Exequial Mass provided that on Sundays and Festivals of obligation the Mass of the day is not omitted.

These provisions cover all cases where private *Requiem* Masses are allowed in connexion with the death and burial—apart from which they enjoy no privilege as to celebration beyond the ordinary *Missae Quotidianae*—but if any further advantage may be reaped from the Indult which was granted Ireland by the Holy See in the year 1862 (*scil.*, for private *Requiem* Masses on day of burial except those mentioned under 3°), it might still be availed of, as there is nothing to show that it has been revoked.¹

P. MORRISROE.

¹ Cf. Maynooth Statutes, 1875, p. 81.

DOCUMENTS

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS X. CONDEMNING AN
ARTICLE OF THE REV. PRINCE MAXIMILIAN OF BAVARIA

ACTA PII PP. X.

EPISTOLA QUA VULGATUM SCRIPTUM QUODDAM REPROBATUR CIRCA
QUAESTIONEM DE ECCLESIIS AD CATHOLICAM UNITATEM
REVOCANDISVENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS ARCHIEPISCOPIS DELEGATIS APOSTO-
LICIS BYZANTII, IN GRAECIA, IN AEGYPTO, IN MESOPOTAMIA,
IN PERSIA, IN SYRIA ET IN INDIIS ORIENTALIBUS CONSI-
DENTIBUS

PIUS PP. X.

VENERABILES FRATRES, SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM

Ex quo, nono labente saeculo, Orientis gentes ab unitate Ecclesiae catholicae coeperunt avelli, vix dici potest quantum a viris sanctis adlaboratum sit, ut dissidentes fratres ad eius gremium revocarentur. Prae ceteris vero Summi Pontifices, Decessores Nostri, pro eo quo fungebantur munere, fidem et unitatem ecclesiasticam tuendi, nil intentatum reliquerunt, ut qua paternis adhortationibus, qua publicis legationibus, qua solemnibus conciliis, funestissimum dissidium tolleretur, quod Occidenti quidem in moerorem cessit, Orienti vero grave intulit damnum. Huius sollicitudinis testes sunt, ut paucos tantum recenseamus, Gregorius IX., Innocentius IV., Clemens IV., Gregorius X., Eugenius IV., Gregorius XIII., et Benedictus XIV.¹ Sed neminem latet, quanto animi sui studio nuperrimo tempore Decessor Noster felicitis recordationis Leo XIII., Orientis gentes invitaverit ut Ecclesiae Romanae iterum consociarentur. *'Nos quidem certe (inquit),² pervetusta Orientis gloria, et in omne genus hominum fama meritorum ipsa recordatione delectat. Ibi enim salutis humani generis incunabula, et christianae sapientiae primordia; illinc omnium beneficiorum, quae una cum sacro Evan-*

¹ Const. *'Nuper ad nos,'* 16 Mart. 1743. aliam fidei professionem Orientalibus praescribit.

² Allocutio *'Si fuit in re,'* 13 Dec. 1880, ad S. R. E. Card., in Aed. Vat.; *Act.*, vol. ii. p. 179; cf. etiam Ep. Ap. *'Praeclara Gratulationis,'* 20 Iun. 1894; *Act.*, vol. xiv. p. 195.

gelio accepimus, velut abundantissimus amnis in Occidentem influxit. . . . Atque haec Nobiscum in animo considerantes, nihil tam cupimus atque optamus, quam dare operam, ut Oriente toto maiorum virtus et magnitudo reviviscat. Eoque magis, quod illic humanorum eventuum is volvitur cursus, ut indicia identidem appareant, quae spem portendant, Orientis populos, ab Ecclesiae Romanae sinu tam diuturno tempore dissociatos, cum eadem aliquando in gratiam, aspirante Deo, redituros.'

Nec, minori sane desiderio Nos ipsi, Ven. Fratres, quod probe nostis, tenemur, ut cito dies illucescat, tot anxii sanctorum virorum votis exoptatus, quo penitus a fundamentis subvertatur murus ille, qui duos iamdiu dividit populos, atque his uno fidei et caritatis amplexu permixtis, pax invocata tandem aliquando refloreat, fiatque *unum ovile et unus pastor*.¹

Nobis tamen haec animo revolventibus, gravis moeroris occasionem nuperrime praebuit scriptum aliquod, in recens condito diario '*Roma e l'Oriente*' evulgatum, cui titulus '*Pensées sur la question de l'union des Églises.*' Enimvero tot iisque tam gravibus erroribus, non modo theologicis, verum etiam historicis, scriptum illud scatet, ut vix possit maior cumulus paucioribus paginis contineri.

Nimirum, ibi non minus temere quam falso huic opinioni fit aditus, dogma de processione Spiritus Sancti a Filio haudquam ex ipsis Evangelii verbis profluere, aut antiquorum Patrum fide comprobari; pariter imprudentissime in dubium revocatur, utrum sacra de Purgatorio ac de Immaculata Beatae Mariae Virginis Conceptione dogmata a sanctis viris priorum saeculorum agnita fuerint; cum vero de Ecclesiae constitutione incidit sermo, primo renovatur error a Decessore Nostro Innocentio X.² iamdiu damnatus, quo suadetur S. Paulum haberi tamquam fratrem omnino parem S. Petro; deinde non minori falsitate iniicitur persuasio, Ecclesiam catholicam non fuisse primis saeculis principatum unius, hoc est *monarchiam*: aut primatum Ecclesiae Romanae nullis validis argumentis inuiti. Sed nec ibidem intacta relinquitur catholica doctrina de Sanctissimo Eucharistiae Sacramento, cum praefracte docetur, sententiam suscipi posse, quae tenet, apud Graecos verba consecratoria effectum non sortiri, nisi iam prolata oratione illa quam *epiclesim* vocant, cum tamen compertum sit Ecclesiae minime competere ius circa ipsam sacramentorum substantiam quidpiam innovandi; cui haud minus

¹ Ioan. x. 16.

² Decr. Congr. gen. S. R. et U. Inquis., 24 Ian. 1647.

absonum est, validam habendam esse Confirmationem a quovis presbytero collatam.¹

Vel ex hoc errorum summario, quibus refertum est illud scriptum, facile intelligitis, Venerabiles Fratres, gravissimum offendiculum omnibus ipsum perlegentibus allatum fuisse, et Nos ipsos magnopere obstupuisse, catholicam doctrinam, non obtectis verbis adeo procaciter perverti, pluraque ad historiam spectantia, de causis orientalis schismatis, a vero audacter nimis detorqueri. Ac primum quidem falso in crimen vocantur sanctissimi Pontifices Nicolaus I. et Leo IX., quasi magna dissensionis pars illius debeatur superbiae et ambitioni, huius vero acribus obiurgationibus; perinde ac si prioris vigor apostolicus in sacrosanctis iuribus tuendis superbiae sit tribuendus; alterius autem sedulitas in coercendis improbis vocari velit crudelitas. Historiae quoque iura concludantur cum sacrae illae expeditiones, quas cruciatas vocant, tamquam latrocinia traducuntur; aut cum, quod etiam gravius est, Romani Pontifices incusantur, quasi studium, quo conati sunt Orientis gentes ad coniunctionem cum Ecclesia Romana vocare, dominandi cupiditati sit adscribendum, non apostolicae sollicitudini pascendi Christi gregis.

Nec stuporem addidit levem quod in eodem scripto adseritur, Graecos Florentiae a Latinis coactos fuisse ut unitati subscriberent, aut eosdem argumentis falsis inductos, ut dogma de processione Spiritus Sancti etiam a Filio susciperent. Quin etiam eo usque proceditur, ut historiae iuribus conculcatis, in dubium revocetur, utrum Generalia Concilia, quae post Graecorum discessionem celebrata sunt, hoc est ab octavo ad Vaticanum, tamquam oecumenica vere sint habenda; unde hybridae cuiusdam unitatis ratio proponitur, id solum ab utraque ecclesia deinceps agnoscendum tamquam legitimum, quod commune patrimonium fuerit ante discessionem, ceteris, tamquam supervacaneis et forte spuris additamentis, alto silentio pressis.

Haec vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, significanda duximus, non solum ut sciatis memoratas propositiones atque sententias falsas, temerarias, a fide catholica alienas a Nobis reprobari, sed etiam ut quantum in vobis est, a populis vigilantiae vestrae commissis tam diram luem propulsare conemini, omnes adhortando, ut in accepta doctrina permaneant, neve alteri unquam consentiant, licet . . . *angelus de caelo evangelizet.*² Simul tamen enixe oramus,

¹ Cf. Bened. XIV. Constituit. '*Etsi pastoralis,*' pro Italo-graecis, 26 Maii 1742, ubi dicit irritam nunc fore confirmationem a simplici presbytero latino ex sola episcopi delegatione collatam.

² Gal. i. 8.

ut eos persuasos faciatis, nihil Nobis antiquius esse, quam ut omnes bonae voluntatis homines vires indefesse exerant, quo concupita unitas citius obtineatur, ut in una fidei catholicae professione, sub uno pastore summo adunentur, quas discordia dispersas retinet oves. Quod facilius quidem continget, si ad Spiritum Sanctum Paraclitum, qui *'non est dissensionis Deus, sed pacis,'*¹ fervidae ingeminentur preces; inde enim fiet ut Christi votum impleatur, quod ante subeundos extremos cruciatus cum gemitibus expressit:² *'Ut omnes unum sint, sicut tu, Pater, in me, et ego in te; ut et ipsi in nobis unum sint.'*

Denique hoc omnes in animum inducant suum, incassum omnino in hoc opere adlaborari, nisi imprimis recta et integra fides catholica retineatur, qualis in Sacra Scriptura, Patrum traditione, Ecclesiae consensu, Conciliis Generalibus, ac Summorum Pontificum decretis est tradita et consecrata. Pergant igitur quotquot contendunt causam tueri unitatis: pergant fidei galea induti, anchoram spei tenentes, caritatis igne succensi, sedulam in hoc divinissimo negotio navare operam; et pacis auctor atque amator Deus, cuius in potestate posita sunt tempora et momenta,³ diem accelerabit, quo Orientis gentes ad catholicam unitatem exultantes sint rediturae, atque huic Apostolicae Sedi coniunctae, depulsis erroribus, salutis aeternae portum ingressurae.

Has Nostras litteras, Venerabiles Fratres, in linguam vernaculam regionis unicuique vestrum concreditae diligenter translatae evulgare curabitis. Dum porro vos certiores facere gaudemus, dilectum Auctorem scripti inconsiderate, sed bona fide ab ipso elucubrati, sincere et ex corde coram Nobis adhaesisse doctrinis in hac epistola expositis, et cuncta quae Sancta Sedes Apostolica docet, reiicit et condemnat, et ipsum, Deo adiuvente, usque ad ultimum vitae finem docere, reiicere et condemnare esse paratum, divinorum auspiciis munerum, Nostraeque benevolentiae testem Apostolicam Benedictionem Vobis peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die xxvi mensis Decembris, anno MCMX, Pontificatus Nostri octavo.

PIVS PP. X.

¹ 1 Cor. xiv. 33.

² Ioan. xvii. 21.

³ Act. i. 7.

THE OATH OF THE MOTU-PROPRIO 'SACRORUM ANTISTITUM'
TO BE TAKEN BY RELIGIOUS AT ORDINATION

S. CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS

DECLARATIONES

CIRCA IUSIURANDUM A MOTU-PROPRIO 'SACRORUM ANTISTITUM'
PRAESCRIPTUM

Propositis huic sacrae Congregationi Consistoriali quae sequuntur dubiis, id est :

I. utrum alumni Religiosi maioribus ordinibus initiandi teneantur dare iusiurandum a Motu-proprio *Sacrorum Antistitum* praescriptum coram Episcopo ordines conferente, an coram moderatore religioso ;

II. coram quonam idem iusiurandum praestare debeant Religiosi qui confessionibus excipiendis et sacris concionibus habendis destinantur ;

III. in quibusnam tabulariis adservanda sint documenta iusiurandi a superius memoratis Religiosis dati ;

SSm̄us Dominus noster Pius PP. X., in audientia diei 16 Decembris 1910 Cardinali Secretario eiusdem sacrae Congregationis concessa, mandavit ut respondeatur ;

ad I. affirmative ad primam partem, negative ad secundam ;
ad II. coram eo, a quo approbationem confessionibus excipiendis et sacris concionibus habendis obtinent.

ad III. in tabulario illius Ordinarii, qui iusiurandum recepit.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus sacrae Congregationis Consistorialis, die 17 Decembris anno 1910.

C. CARD. DE LAI, *Secretarius.*
S. TECCHI, *Adessor.*

L. ✠ S.

DECREE RELATING TO REMOVAL OF PARISH PRIESTS
BINDING IN ENGLAND AND UNITED STATES

S. CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS

DE DECRETO 'MAXIMA CURA'

I

In generali conventu Sacrae Congregationis Consistorialis habito die 23 februarii 1911, proposito dubio : 'An vigeat in Anglia novissimum de emotione administrativa ab officio et beneficio curato Decretum 'Maxima Cura' Em̄i PP., requisito

Consultorum voto aliisque perpensis, respondendum censuerunt :
' *Affirmative.*'

Facta autem relatione SSiño D. N. Pio PP. X. ab infrascripto Cardinali Secretario in audientia diei 24 Februarii 1911, SSiñus resolutionem ratam habuit et confirmavit.

Romae, die 28 Februarii 1911.

C. CARD. DE LAI, *Secretarius.*

L. ✠ S.

SCIPIO TECCHI, *Adessor.*

2.

Ad dubium ab aliquibus propositum, ' an decretum ' *Maxima Cura* ' vigeat pro dioecesibus Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis ' haec Sacra Consistorialis Congregatio respondit : ' *Affirmative.*' iuxta resolutionem datam pro dioecesibus Angliae sub die 28 Februarii 1911.

Romae, die 13 Martii 1911.

C. CARD. DE LAI, *Secretarius.*

L. ✠ S.

SCIPIO TECCHI, *Adessor.*

**INDULGENCE FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE SODALITY OF
THE HOLY CHILDHOOD**

PARTIALIS INDULGENTIA PERPETUA PRO SOCIIS ARCHISODALITATIS

AB INFANTE IESU UBIQUE TERRARUM

PIUS PP. X.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Quum Nostrum subit animum grata ac iucunda Infantis Iesu memoria, talis haec recordatio ineuntis aetatis laetitiam renovat, germanamque fidem in Augustum Dominicae Incarnationis Mysterium excitat ac fovet. Quare devotionem erga Puerum Iesu magis ac magis in dies in Christiano populo provehere, salutare ac frugiferum consilium Nobis videtur, ideoque Archisodalitatem a Divo Infante Bethlemi canonice institutam, quae sibi eundem finem proponit amplificandi inter fideles erga Divinum Infantem pietatem, iam per similes Litteras Nostras peculiaribus privilegiis donavimus atque auximus. Nunc autem cum eiusdem Moderator Nos enixis precibus adierit, ut sodalibus piam in honorem Divini Pueri iaculatoriam precem recitantibus, de thesauro Ecclesiae partialem indulgentiam largiri, de Apostolica benignitate, dignemur, Nos votis his annuendum ultro libenterque existimamus. Quamobrem de Omni-

potentis Dei misericordia ac BB. Petri et Pauli App. Eius auctoritate confisi, omnibus et singulis fidelibus ex utroque sexu, in Archisodalitatem ab Infante Iesu Bethlemi institutam, sive in praesens adlectis, sive in posterum perpetuo, rite, in universo terrarum orbe adlegendis, qui corde saltem contriti, quovis idiomate, dummodo versio fidelis sit, hanc iaculatoriam precem devote recitent, quae latine audit ‘*Dulcissime Puer Iesu miserere nobis*’ quoties id agant, toties de numero poenaliu dierum, in forma Ecclesiae consueta, trecentos expungimus. Insuper largimur fidelibus iisdem si malint liceat, hac partiali indulgentia vita functorum labes poenasque expiare. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Praesentibus perpetuis futuris temporibus valituris. Volumus autem ut praesentium litterarum transumptis seu exemplis etiam impressis, manu alicuius notarii publici subscriptis, et sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae munitis, eadem prorsus fides adhibeatur, quae adhiberetur ipsis praesentibus, si forent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die XXV Februarii MCMXI, Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *a Secretis Status.*

L. ✠ S.

THE TIME FOR TAKING OATH AGAINST MODERNISM

S. CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS

DE MOTU PROPRIO ‘SACRORUM ANTISTITUM’

Cum in Motu proprio ‘*Sacrorum Antistitum*’ statutum sit ut fidei professio cum iureiurando contra Modernistarum errores praestetur a parochis aliisque beneficiatis ante ineundam beneficii possessionem, quaesitum est ‘utrum adhuc maneat facultas facta a S. Concilio Tridentino, qua provisi de beneficiis quibuscumque, fidei professionem emittere possunt intra duos menses a die adeptae possessionis.’

Re autem pertractata penes S. hanc Congregationem, cum Consultoris voto, ab infrascripto Cardinali relatio facta est SSmo D. N. Pio PP. X., qui, omnibus perpensis, proposito dubio mandavit ut respondeatur: ‘*Negative*’ ac proinde in posterum fidei professionem emittendam esse ante possessionem beneficii.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus S. C. Consistorialis, die I Martii 1911.

C. CARD. DE LAI, *Secretarius.*

L. ✠ S.

SCIPIO TECCHI, *Adessor.*

BOOKS OF LITURGICAL CHANT

S. CONGREGATIO RITUUM

RATISBONEN

DE EDENDIS PROPRIIS CANTUM LITURGICUM CONTINENTIBUS

Fridericus Pustet, Sanctae Sedis Apostolicae et S. Rituum Congregationis typographus, de consensu Rm̃i sui Ordinarii Ratisbonensis, humiliter expetivit a Sacra Rituum Congregatione, ut ipsa declarare dignaretur, quis modus servandus sit de expetenda approbatione Propriorum alicuius Dioecesis vel Ordinis ad Graduale vel Antiphonale Romanum Vaticanæ editionis, et praesertim :

I. Utrum Propria, quae exhibent cantum gregorianum, indigeant Approbatione Sacrae Rituum Congregationis pro prima editione ?

II. Et quatenus affirmative ad I, utrum etiam pro sequentibus editionibus ?

III. Et quatenus negative ad II., utrum praeter licentiam Ordinarii loci, in quo praedicta Propria evulgantur, requiratur insuper licentia Antistitis respectivi Ordinis vel Dioecesis ?

IV. Qua approbatione indigeant illa Propria ad Graduale vel Antiphonale Romanum Vaticanæ editionis, quae exhibent cantum gregorianum notis modernis transcriptum ?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, audita Commissionis Liturgicae sententia, una cum voto Praesidis Commissionis de musica et cantu sacro, reque sedulo perpensa ac discussa, ita respondendum censuit :

Ad I. *Affirmative* : et singula cuiuslibet Proprii seu novi Officii aut Missae folia, apud quemlibet typographum composita, in triplici exemplari vel singillatim vel simul sumpta ad Sacram Rituum Congregationem pro revisione et definitiva approbatione transmittantur ; praehabita quidem licentia illius Ordinarii loci vel Moderatoris supremi Ordinis sive Instituti, in cuius usum paratur editio, quae veluti typica pro futuris editionibus inserviet.

Ad II. *Negative*, dummodo subsequentes editiones cum prima typica editione sive Proprii sive novi Officii aut Missae fideliter concordent ; prouti Decretum sacrae Rituum Congregationis sub die II Augusti 1905, quod Instructiones circa editionem et approbationem librorum cantum liturgicum gregorianum continentium exhibent, omnino declarat et iubet.

Ad III. Requiritur pro subsequentibus editionibus tam approbatio Ordinarii Dioecesis vel Moderatoris Supremi Ordinis seu

Congregationis, in cuius usum ipsae editiones parantur, quam licentia Ordinarii loci, in quo huiusmodi editiones conficiuntur et evulgantur.

Ad IV. Requiritur et sufficit approbatio Ordinarii Dioecesis vel Moderatoris Ordinis sive instituti, atque licentia Ordinarii illius loci, ubi tales editiones parantur sive evulgantur, prouti in responsione ad dubium III. superius indicatur.

Declarat autem sacra Rituum Congregatio tum Decretum approbationis a se dandum primae editioni alicuius Proprii sive novi Officii aut Missae cantum gregorianum liturgicum exhibenti cum approbationem Ordinarii Dioecesis aut Moderatoris Supremi Ordinis sive Instituti atque licentiam Ordinarii loci, ut supra, in scriptis praevis ab editoribus expetendam et obtinendam, omnino debere integre et fideliter in principio vel in fine Proprii vel Officii novi aut Missae publicari.

Atque ita rescipsit, die 24 Februarii 1911.

FR. S. CARD. MARTINELLI, *Praefectus*.

L. ✠ S.

✠ PETRUS LA FONTAINE, *Epis. Charystien., Secretarius*.

INSTRUCTION TO ORDINARIES ABOUT CONDITION OF FREEDOM IN REGARD TO MATRIMONY

S. CONGREGATIO DE SACRAMENTIS

INSTRUCTIO AD ORDINARIOS CIRCA STATUM LIBERUM AC DENUNCIATIONEM INITI MATRIMONII

Perlatum haud semel est ad hanc S. Congregationem de disciplina Sacramentorum, in quibusdam regionibus parochos matrimoniis adsistere, praesertim advenarum, non comprobato rite ac legitime statu libero contrahentium, eiusque rei causa non defuisse qui alteras nuptias attentare sint ausi.

Haud pauci praeterea Ordinarii conquesti sunt, initorum notitiam connubiorum, quae vi decreti: *Ne temere*, editi a S. C. Concilii die II. mensis augusti anno MDCCCXVII, transmittenda est ad parochum baptismi coniugum, saepe omni fidei testimonio esse destitutam debitisque indiciis carere.

Ad haec incommoda removenda Eūni Patres huius S. Congregationis in generali conventu habito in aedibus Vaticanis die VII mensis Februarii MDCCCXI, praescribenda censuerunt ea quae sequuntur:

I. In memoriam redigatur parochorum haud licere ipsis adesse matrimonio, *nisi constituto sibi legitime de libero statu con-*

trahentium, servatis de iure servandis: (cf. Decr. *Ne temere*, n. V. § 2); iidemque praesertim moneantur ne omittant baptismi testimonium a contrahentibus exigere, si hic alia in paroecia fuerit illis collatus.

II. Ut autem quae n. IX. § 2 memorati Decreti praescripta sunt rite serventur, celebrati matrimonii denuntiatio, ad baptismi parochum transmittenda, coniugum eorumque parentum nomina et agnomina descripta secumferat, aetatem contrahentium, locum diemque nuptiarum, testium qui interfuerunt nomina et agnomina habeatque parochi subscriptum nomen cum adiecto parochiali sigillo. Inscriptio autem accurata indicet paroeciam, dioecesim, oppidum seu locum baptismi coniugum, et ea quae ad scripta per publicos portitores tuto transmittenda pertinent.

III. Si forte accidat ut, adhibitis etiam cautelis, de quibus n. I., baptismi parochus, in recipienda denuntiatione matrimonii comperiat alterutrum contrahentium aliis nuptiis iam esse alligatum, rem quantocius significabit parocho attentati matrimonii.

IV. Ordinarii sedulo advigilent ut haec praescripta religiose serventur, et transgressores, si quos invenerint, curent ad officium revocare, adhibitis etiam, ubi sit opus, canonicis poenis.

Ex Aedibus eiusdem S. C. die 6 Martii 1911.

D. CARD. FERRATA, *Praefectus*.

L. ✠ S.

PH. GIUSTINI, *Secretarius*.

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS X. TO CARDINAL
GIBBONS

EPISTOLA

AD IACOBUM CARD. GIBBONS, ARCHIEPISCOPUM BALTIMORENSIUM,
OB LITTERAS OBSEQUII AC VENERATIONIS PLENAS, BEATISSIMO
PATRI, NOMINE ETIAM CETERORUM ANTISTITUM AMERICAЕ
WASHINGTONII CONGREGATORUM REVERENTER MISSAS.

Dilecte fili Noster, salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.—
Minime sane praeter opinionem accidit ac spem ut tu quoque,
Dilecte Fili Noster, novum praeberes veteris necessitudinis tuae
testimonium, iniurias scilicet et ipse expostulando quibus proximo
Septembri dum heic Romae captae Urbis celebraretur memoria,
palam laccessiti fuimus ac procaciter. Quod quidem testimonium
eo gratius accidit quo uberius. Etenim non tuae tantum exitit
pietatis nuncium, sed et pietatis Antistitum qui tecum una

Washingtonium nuper convenerant ; quorum omnium et iudicia et sensus, sensui iudicioque tuo simillima, litterae tuae declararunt. Cepimus inde suavissimae iucunditatis fructum, quantum aliquis ex optatissima re capere potest maximum : ac pietatis Nostrae partes duximus tibi rescribere ut gratias ageremus ; quas sane pergratum facies si, verbis Nostris, iis egeris quos in hac studiorum significatione socios habuisti. His porro, tibi in primis, Clerisque populisque cuiusque vestrum concreditae coelestia munera adprecamur, eorumdemque auspicem atque insimul benevolentiae Nostrae testem, Apostolicam Benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae, apud Sanctum Petrum, in praeludio Natalis Christi humani generis Servatoris, anno MCMX, Pontificatus vero Nostri octavo.

PIUS PP. X.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

INSTITUTIONES MORALES ALPHONSIANAE, seu Doctoris Ecclesiae S. Alphonsi Mariae de Ligorio Doctrina Moralis ad usum Scholarum accomodata, cura et studio P. Clementis Mark, C.SS.R. Editio Decima Quarta. Roma: Cuggiani. 1911. Two vols.

WE are glad to welcome this fourteenth edition of the work on Moral Theology of Father Mark. This work is already well known and highly appreciated in the schools. It stands with Gury and Lehmkühl, Noldin and Génicot, in the forefront of standard authorities on the subjects with which it deals. It has all the qualities of solidity and sound judgment of the works of St. Alphonsus himself in the same department: but it condenses, abbreviates, and brings into order better suited to the schools the treatises of the master. We do not think it necessary to go closely into the matter of the two volumes. A work that has reached its fourteenth edition is not in need of our praise; nor is it likely to be shaken by our criticism, although there are a few points on which we could express dissent from the view adopted by the learned author. They are not very important points, however, and Father Mark can always give substantial reasons for the views he adopts. We will only say that the treatment of marriage, particularly the impediments of clandestinity, public honesty, and mixed religion, is brought thoroughly up to date on the most orthodox lines. The same may be said of several questions in the treatise 'De Justitia' and 'De Statu Religioso.' The priest who possesses Father Mark's *Moral Theology* has a good friend and a safe guide.

D.

LES CHRÉTIENNES CELTIQUES. Par Dom Louis Gougand, Bénédictin de St. Michel de Farnborough. Paris: Lecoffre, 90 Rue Bonaparte. 1911.

THIS is a very attractive volume, showing the deep interest being taken just now in all things Celtic by scholars in various countries. Judging by the bibliography and analysis of the sources from which he drew Dom Gougand must be a very voracious reader. He has evidently somewhat of the German

patience and thoroughness, though these qualities are gained at the loss of others which we had come to regard as almost distinctively French. It is no great wonder that in expressing his judgment on such a vast variety of writers Dom Gougand should now and again have accepted the opinions of others rather than have formed his own by personal investigation and study. Hence we do not always agree with the note either of praise or blame that he attaches to the different works enumerated in his 'sources.'


Ireland certainly comes in for the chief share of recognition in the *Chrétientés Celtiques*, and the origin of Christianity in Ireland is dealt with at some length. Nothing, however, of any value is added to the knowledge we had on this head already. The chapter on 'Les Expansions Irlandaises' is good as far as it goes; but it does not go very far, and that is a pity; for Dom Gougand has some very useful passages on various aspects of the expansion in Gaul and Germany.

In his chapter on 'Les Controverses Disciplinaires,' 'Easter,' 'The Tonsure,' 'The Authority of the Holy See,' Dom Gougand follows the beaten track and writes nothing very startling. A chapter on 'La Culture Intellectuelle' is, perhaps, the most readable in the book.

X. Y.

THE 'TABLET' AND RAILWAY TICKETS

WE notice that in a recent issue the *Tablet* reaffirms its 'authoritative' decision that Catholics may with a safe conscience violate certain regulations of railway companies which they had freely contracted to observe, sanctioned though these may be by public authority, and upheld as they are in the law-courts. The *Tablet* here quite unnecessarily reveals its weakness. Its 'authoritative' decision is the decision of a private and unnamed individual, for whose defective theology the *Editor*, in an unlucky moment and with rather quixotic pretensions, undertook responsibility. All we will say is that should any Catholics be so rash and so ill-advised as to follow the *Tablet* in this matter, we shall not be in the least sorry to see them receive the full measure of punishment which the law inflicts on those who knowingly violate the regulations in question.



ERASMUS AND THE MOVEMENTS OF HIS TIME

IN all great movements of the world's history we find some one, who might be regarded as centralizing in himself the dominant ideas of the Movement. Erasmus lived when the Renaissance was at its height, and the varied streams of its influence seemed to have converged in him. He lived, too, when another movement convulsed Europe: when Luther raised the standard of revolt, and set on foot his spurious reformation. It will not be uninteresting to study the relations of Erasmus to these two movements, and in doing so we shall get some light on the inter-relation of the movements themselves. But first we must know something of his life, for in him especially is it true that his writings have taken their colour from the events of his life and the environment in which he lived.

Desiderius Erasmus was born at Rotterdam in 1467. His real name was Gerard Gerardson, but it was the fashion then to translate the name from the vernacular into a classical equivalent, and Erasmus, who in after years was 'one of the greatest masters of literary style,'¹ had the misfortune to be designated by two barbarous names, one Latin and the other Greek. He passed some years at school both at Gouda and Utrecht, and then moved on to a higher school, at Deventer, where he had as his companion the future Pope Adrian VI. Even at that early

¹ Jebb's Essay on Erasmus.

age he showed signs of ripening genius, and his future greatness was predicted by Rudolph Agricola, one of the first men to bring the New Learning¹ across the Alps. Deventer was an unusually good school for these days, and in it Erasmus laid the foundation of that great fluency in Latin he acquired in after years.

At the age of thirteen his mother died, and his father did not long survive her. The guardians of Erasmus were bent on making him embrace the monastic state, but he obstinately resisted the idea. However, they sent him to the monastery of Hertogenbosch, where young men were trained for the different religious Orders. There, to use his own phrase, he was broken in to the monastic life. The only effect on Erasmus was to increase his disinclination for a state to which he felt he was not called. Yielding at last to the pressure of his guardians he consented to become a religious, and entered as a novice the House of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine at Stein. In 1486 he made his solemn profession, and received the habit of the Order. He spent five years at Stein, but he found the restrictions of monastic rule irksome, and the lives of the monks unedifying. They had little respect for the pursuit of knowledge, and viewed with suspicion the classical and patristic studies to which by this time Erasmus had almost wholly given his allegiance. Even to the detriment of his health he pursued these studies furtively and eagerly during the time that remained after the performance of his allotted duties. These years at Stein reveal in some measure the

¹ I use the expression 'New Learning' in its modern sense of the Revival of Letters, without, I hope, helping to perpetuate the error that has resulted from this use of the phrase. Abbot Gasquet (vide *The Eve of the Reformation in England*, chap. ii.) has rendered not the least of his services, to scholarship and to truth, by showing that the original meaning of the phrase was the novel doctrines preached by Luther and his followers, and by pointing out the confusion that has arisen from its modern use. It has been wrongly concluded that because orthodox churchmen were opposed to the New Learning (in the old sense), they were opposed to the Revival of Letters. Further, it has been wrongly inferred that because Erasmus and his friends were prominent in the Revival of Letters, they were in sympathy with the New Learning, in the sense of Luther's doctrines. I use the phrase for convenience in its modern sense, but this note will, I hope, prevent ambiguity.

source of that bitter antipathy to monks that later characterized his satiric writings.

Already he had gained the reputation of a brilliant scholar, and the Bishop of Cambrai offered him the post of secretary, which he accepted. He quitted his monastery in 1491, never to return to it. He remained with the Bishop five years, during which time he received priesthood. The Bishop then sent him to Paris to pursue his studies, obtaining a place for him at Montagu College. But he found living there as difficult as he had found it at Stein, and he left the college after a year's trial, bringing nothing away from it, as he affirms, but a body full of infection. He returned to Cambrai, but after a brief period we find him again in Paris. This time he took a room in a private house, and supported himself by acting as tutor in Latin. Two of his pupils were English—one, Thomas Grey, the uncle of Lady Jane Grey, the other William Blount, afterwards Lord Mountjoy. With the latter he contracted an intimate and lasting friendship, the first fruits of which were a pension of a hundred crowns and an invitation to visit England, which he accepted in 1497. The visit was in a measure the turning point of his career. It was only recently the New Learning had penetrated into England, but there was a little band of learned men who devoted their best energies to the revival of classical studies. Erasmus, in one of his own brilliant phrases, tells us he regards as a fellow-countryman (*ὁμοπατρίδα*) whoever has been initiated into the sacred mysteries of the Muses, and here he felt he was no stranger in a strange land. Through the influence of Mountjoy he was introduced to this learned coterie, and found them one with himself in aspirations, and actuated by the same ideals. But more priceless still was the friendship, broken only by death, of such men as Thomas More, Colet, and Fisher, who were the soul of this new movement in England. It has been assumed, with the facility which often distinguishes Protestant historians, that it was only when the glorious dawn of the Reformation broke upon England, and dispelled the darkness of medieval Catholicism, that classical culture found a home there.

But far other was the case. For, before that blessed word 'reform' was heard or dreamt of, we find as the pioneers of the Renaissance movement men who afterwards shed their blood for the Catholic Faith. More was one of the great leaders in the attempt to revive the culture of the ancients, and one of the noblest characters of his time. He was at once statesman, scholar, wit, and saint. Mr. Lily¹ has selected him as the typical saint of the Renaissance. His devotion to higher learning was supreme, and the fount of his wit was not dried up by the depth of his sanctity. He was above all the type of the very human saint, which we all so much admire. It was singularly fortunate for Erasmus, in what was for him a formative period, to come into contact with men in whom Christian and Catholic instincts were so deeply implanted. His friendship with More was a firm and tender one, as is evidenced by that brilliant series of letters that passed between them. These letters are scintillating with wit, and bring out in bold relief the diverse characters of the two men: the strong confiding faith of More, his genial good nature, the ironical temperament and sceptical tendencies of Erasmus. In one of his letters Erasmus has given a portrait of his friend that for vividness could hardly be surpassed by the colours of Holbein.

In 1498 Erasmus went to Oxford, and stayed in the Augustinian House there. The prior, Richard Charnock, was a learned and pious man. Erasmus found in the University an enthusiastic group of Hellenists, and was charmed with his friends and surroundings. His letters at this time are full of the pleasure he has derived from his English visit, and among other things he tells us he has become a good horseman and a tolerable courtier. He quitted England in 1550, after a farewell visit to More. One result of his visit was to deepen and strengthen his character, especially on the religious side. He found there the best elements of the Renaissance movement: men who combined solid piety with an unfaltering zeal in the cause

¹ *Renaissance Types.*

of higher studies. It was probably under the influence of his visit that he wrote a devotional work, the *Enchiridion Militis Christiani*. In it he insists on one of his favourite topics: that Christianity is a rational homage, that true devotion does not consist in a dreary round of formalism, but in prayers springing from the heart.

He spent the years 1500-1505 mostly in Paris, and applied himself diligently to the study of Greek. Apart from its humanistic value, he wished to be proficient in it as an aid to the interpretation of the New Testament, a translation of which he published some years later. About this time he wrote the *Adagia*, a collection of proverbs from Greek and Latin authors, which by means of short commentaries he applies to the conditions of his own day. The work, which had a brilliant and instantaneous success, is in every way typical of his genius. It exhibits at once his wide culture in the classics, his penetrating grasp of problems then calling for solution, his consciousness of current abuses, and his keen pungent wit. There were two chief objects of his aversion. One was Scholasticism as then professed. It seemed, indeed, as if all the traditions of the golden age of Scholastic Philosophy had vanished, and men were concentrating their attention on barren ineptitudes. He considered the system a mockery and an obstacle to the spread of polite learning. But the monks of his time were an object of even more rooted aversion. One must tread cautiously in dealing with the opinions of Erasmus on this question. Part of his antipathy might be accounted for by the bitter memories of former years. He felt as if the monks had blighted his life, and that he had been entrapped into a state to which he was not called. But, making all allowance for his prejudices, there is some justification for these violent diatribes that fill almost every page of his works. A number of monastic institutions—especially in the Netherlands, Germany, and England—had fallen away from their primitive fervour, and Erasmus is never weary of denouncing their ignorance and depravity. He was the great apostle of the New Learning, and exhibited all the zeal of an apostle. He looked upon the stolid ignorance of

these monks—an ignorance in which they often gloried—as the chief obstacle to its propagation. He looked upon it as likely to frustrate the life's task he had set himself : to find a home for classical culture in the Northern countries. His satiric genius would always have been sure of finding some outlet, but with these ideals dominating his life and thought, such monks he regarded as a legitimate object for unmeasured invective. True, there were many religious who shared his views on the value of classical studies, but by most they were looked upon as a pest. Yet with all his bitterness Erasmus never attacks monasticism as such, and, despite his own example, he could still warn a monk against deserting his cloister.

Towards the end of 1505 Erasmus was again in England. He visited Cambridge, and during his stay again saw a good deal of Thomas More. He was now invited to accompany to Italy the sons of Dr. Boyer, the court physician, and thus was realized one of the great ambitions of his life. In all ages that enchanted land has cast its spell over the minds of men, but it had an added charm in this age for a scholar like Erasmus. It was the Mecca of all humanists, the cradle of the Renaissance. It is difficult now to realize what was the full significance of that wonderful movement. It had begun as early as the days of Petrarch and Boccaccio. It was a kind of second spring and rebirth of the human mind. Men had left behind the barbarism of the Middle Ages, and a new vista of beauty spread out before them in the literatures and art of Greece and Rome. The early Middle Ages have been called barbarous, and in many respects they were, and we can imagine the effect when the beauties of classical literature and art, buried for centuries, emerged at length from the tomb. It was like the revelation of the Madonnas of Cimabue and Giotto to minds which had known only the crude efforts of Byzantine art. From the fourteenth century onwards there was an unwearied search for every vestige of antiquity, and as fresh manuscripts or some creation of an ancient artist was discovered, they were greeted with a frenzy of enthusiasm. Men were captivated by the beauty of form and expression

revealed in these works, and it became their highest ambition to model themselves on the antique. Erasmus reached Italy at the flood-tide of the movement, when it filled every nook and inlet of existing civilization. Even the walls of the Sistine Chapel bear witness to the power of this wonderful revival. In the 'Last Judgment' of Michelangelo there is a strange medley of pagan and Christian elements, and side by side with the grand, imposing figures of the prophets are the equally grand and imposing figures of the sybils. He lavishes no less art in depicting the inspired features of the Cumæan Sybil than in depicting the sorrows and tears of Jeremiah.

This wonderful movement has presented itself under different aspects to different minds. For men like Poggio and Valla it was pagan in its origin and development, and because so it was the incarnation of the highest culture and æstheticism. Equally extreme is the view of Savonarola. He also regarded it as purely pagan, and so to be rejected as a thing unclean. There was a saner view, lying midway between the extravagant idolatry of the one, and the violent antipathy of the other. There were men who, while remaining true to Christian ideals, aimed at absorbing and Christianizing all they found good in the works of the ancients. It was with these Erasmus had ranged himself. He could point to great names in his support: More and Fisher in England, and greater still the name of Tommaso Parentucelli, afterwards Pope Nicholas V. He was one of the most accomplished and enthusiastic humanists of his time, and with him it was said the Renaissance ascended the Papal throne. He indeed sums up in himself the official attitude of the Church. One of the charges most frequently levelled against the Catholic Church is that of obscurantism, a charge that breaks down when viewed in the light of an impartial examination. Some of the greatest churchmen have been foremost in their admiration for classical literature and art, and their aim has been to transfuse with a Christian spirit and raise to a higher sphere all that is good in the creations of pagan genius. It may safely be said that without the patronage of the Church the

Renaissance movement could never have gathered such force.

Erasmus in many ways was one of the best Christian exponents of the movement. He was a refined humanist, acquainted with the best authors of antiquity, and he applied the many useful lessons they taught to contemporary conditions. One of his favourite theories was that the evils then existing in Church and State were due in great measure to ignorance, and his aim in all his works was to dispel this prevailing ignorance and refine society. It was with this end in view he wrote his *Colloquies*, intended especially to aid the studies of the young. The style of these dialogues is terse, pointed, and witty. The old theme of the ignorance and degeneracy of the monks is not neglected, but many of the *Colloquies* breathe a spirit of piety, playfulness, and childlike simplicity that, on first thoughts, we would hardly be inclined to associate with certain aspects of his genius. Like all the works of Erasmus, they are written in Latin, then the universal medium of intercourse among the learned. He was indeed a well of Latin undefiled, and I think there is nowhere exhibited more clearly than in these dialogues his perfect mastery of the language, and his power of applying it to the most trivial and commonplace subjects. He displays above all an intimate knowledge of Terence. He had published scholarly editions of this poet, as well as of Seneca, Suetonius, Pliny, and certain works of Cicero.¹ In Greek one of his favourite authors was Lucian, whose satiric genius was congenial to his taste. Among his better-known works was the *Ciceronianus*,² a dialogue treating of Latin style. It was designed to combat a widely-prevailing notion that Cicero was the only model of pure Latinity. Though admitting the excellence of Cicero, he protested against this monopoly. He was fiercely attacked for this dialogue by Julius Cæsar Scaliger, who denounced him as a parricide, a parasite, and a corrector of printer's proofs. The name of Erasmus is especially

¹ J. E. Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. ii. p. 131.

² Sandys, *Harvard Lectures on the Revival of Learning*, p. 162.

associated with one achievement in the classical world. There was in his day a heated controversy on the subject of Greek pronunciation. One party advocated the pronunciation employed in modern Greek, which depends wholly on stress accent. Erasmus took an opposite view, and in a brilliant pamphlet fixed the pronunciation that obtains in Europe to the present day.

We left Erasmus on his way to Italy. His first halt was at Turin, where he received his Doctorate of Theology. Then he proceeded to Bologna, in time to witness the triumphal entry of Pope Julius II. into that city, after a victory gained to ensure the integrity of the Papal States. Erasmus made only a short stay at Bologna, and next proceeded to Venice. It has been said of him that he imported into Italy the dignity and learning other men were accustomed to bring from there. Anyhow he was welcomed by all the prominent humanists in that city. Venice was then a centre of activity in Renaissance studies, owing to the presence of the Aldine Press; and Aldus, its originator, admitted Erasmus into the select circle of literary men he had gathered round him. Finally, Erasmus repaired to Rome in time to witness a second triumphal entry of the Pope into that city. Here again he was received with distinction, especially by a large number of high ecclesiastics interested in the classical revival. Some of them were anxious to retain him at Rome, and offered him a post there; but Henry VIII. had lately been crowned king, and perhaps hoping for a more generous patronage from him, he once more turned his eyes to England.

He had spent three years in Italy. His impressions of that country were in a measure conflicting. He was shocked by a number of abuses he found existing there. The Church showed few signs of vigorous life. A degree of laxity and decadence reigned in ecclesiastical circles, and many, succumbing entirely to the seductive influences of the New Learning, while professing Christianity, were pagan at heart. He was dissatisfied also with the military policy of the Pope. But the state of polite learning was all that his ardent enthusiasm in its cause could desire. He had

here come into contact with the heart of the movement, his mind was quickened by intercourse with its leaders, and for the first time was revealed to him the whole panorama of that marvellous revival, glimpses of which had only as yet appeared in the Northern countries. There is one strange feature of his visit—an apparent lack of appreciation for all but the literary remains of antiquity. He seemed utterly insensible to monuments in stone and marble. At that time many of the greatest art treasures of the ancients had been discovered and were finding a place in the museums of Florence and Rome. Many of the finest remains of the architectural genius of the Romans were surviving almost unimpaired, and the later spirit of vandalism, which converted the Coliseum and the temples of the Forum into a quarry for the building of a new Rome, had hardly as yet made its appearance. Yet the enthusiasm of Erasmus was awakened more by a manuscript of Lucian than by the grandeur of the Coliseum and the Baths of Caracalla.

In 1510 we find him in England, and once again in the house of his old friend, More. There he wrote the *Encomium Morie*, or *Praise of Folly*, perhaps the best known of all his works, and certainly one of the most bitter satires ever penned. The satire has more affinity with the playful bantering of Horace than with Juvenal's stern indignation. He passes in review the general foibles of human nature, but reserves his severest censure for abuses in the Church, and the old familiar topics of the degeneracy of the monks, and the pedantries of a decadent Scholasticism.

In 1513 he was invited to Cambridge by Bishop Fisher. For a time he taught Greek there, but was soon appointed to a professorship of theology. While there he made a pilgrimage to the shrine of Our Lady at Walsingham in Norfolk, and as a votive offering hung up a copy of Greek iambic verses. They were to the effect that while others bring rich gifts and crave for worldly blessings, he asks only for a pure heart. These verses are still extant, and the late Professor Jebb, one of the most competent of judges, declared in a criticism of them : ' There

are some faults of metre, but the diction is classical and idiomatic; probably no one in Europe at the time, except perhaps Budæus, could have written better.' As a result of the influence of Erasmus at Cambridge, we are told, in a letter dated 1516, that 'people are devoting themselves eagerly to Greek there.' At this time also he was busy with translations from St. Basil, and in revising a text of St. Jerome. He writes then: 'My mind is in such a glow over Jerome that I could fancy myself actually inspired.' It was in these years that he prepared his translation of the New Testament. He was anxious above all that men should know the Scriptures better, and for that reason wished to have them translated into every tongue. 'I long,' he says, 'that the husbandman should sing them to himself as he follows the plough, that the weaver should hum them to the tune of his shuttle, that the traveller should beguile with them the weariness of his journey.'¹

He left England in 1514. He had formed extravagant expectations of what Henry VIII. would do for men of letters, but he was disappointed in such hopes. He paid a last visit to that country in the following year, and the remaining years of his life were spent amid the turmoil and excitement of the Reformation quarrel. Luther had raised the standard of revolt and cast off his allegiance to Rome. Though much has been written on the subject, it is not an easy matter to give a fair and accurate appreciation of the attitude of Erasmus towards the Reformation. He has the distinction of being claimed as an adherent by the most opposite parties. Many of the Lutherans of his day declared that his sentiments harmonized perfectly with theirs; and while some of the orthodox viewed him in the light of a traitor and a renegade, others looked on him as their champion. I recently came across an essay dealing with his religious opinions, in which the writer, evidently a High Church Anglican, was sure he had proved to demonstration that Erasmus had no sympathy with Protestantism as such, but that like Anglo-Catholics, as they style them-

¹ Vide Jebb's Essay on Erasmus.

selves, his final court of appeal was to the Christianity of the first four centuries. The genius of Erasmus was in truth many-sided, and in a measure unrestrained. He saw what no one with an unbiassed mind could be blind to: that enormous abuses existed in the Church, which had almost effaced the image of Christ there. He was unsparing in his criticisms even of men in high ecclesiastical positions, and these criticisms were characterized by a freedom and a virulence which few had employed before his time. When we read the long litany of abuses then prevailing, in the pages of a sober historian like Pastor, we might find some palliation for these fierce diatribes of Erasmus, and charitably suppose that they sprang partly from his satiric genius, but partly also from true religious feeling. But his example of free criticism, his castigation of abuses, and the ridicule he poured on some existing customs must, in the nature of things, have helped on the cause of Luther, though the standpoint of the two men was widely different. Luther's position was strengthened by various factors. The evils existing in the Church gave some colour to the campaign he was waging against Rome, but in a greater measure still he was aided by the enmity of Teuton against Latin, which had been gathering force for centuries. His movement lopped of its political aspect could never have attained such success. A national spirit was stirring in the Northern countries, that was in revolt against the authority of the Holy Roman Empire, and this national spirit was to be sealed by a national Church. But it was evident from the beginning that Luther aimed not at reformation, but at deformation and destruction, and here Erasmus refused to follow him. He had sufficient faith in the divine plan of the Church to recognize that any genuine reform should spring from its own innate strength. He did not believe in Luther's iconoclastic policy, and perhaps his penetrating mind saw that the doctrines of the reformer, especially on marriage and free-will, tended to sap the very foundations of society, and bring those disastrous consequences to social order that afflicted Germany a generation after his death. But over and above this, there was something that appealed

more strongly to the feelings of Erasmus. He recognized that Luther, his party, and his programme were as great enemies to polite learning as the obscurantists on the Catholic side. Even then there were some who tried to identify the novel doctrines of Luther with the Revival of Letters. Erasmus endeavoured to keep the two issues separate, and pointed out that there was no essential connexion between them. 'Luther,' as he tells us in one of his letters, 'has always despised the ancients.'

It was in 1519 that the Reformer made his protest at Wittenberg. Erasmus thought that the quarrel between him and Rome might yet be peaceably adjusted. About this time Luther addressed him a letter, expressing the hope that as one of the great intellectual leaders of the day he might count on his sympathy and support. The reply of Erasmus was guarded, and urged him to counsels of moderation. By 1521 it was evident that all hope of a reconciliation between Luther and Rome had vanished. The Lutherans began to press Erasmus to join their side, contending that their aim was to reform the very abuses which he himself had condemned. But Erasmus could not subscribe to their methods, and in 1524 he published a treatise on Free-Will in opposition to the teaching of Luther, who maintained that man's will possessed no freedom of itself but was moved by Divine Grace alone. It was clear henceforward on which side Erasmus had ranged himself. Beyond this, however, he did not take a prominent public part in the controversy. He was blamed by many for not having come forward and taken a more definite stand on the side of orthodoxy, but he apparently preferred the tranquillity and peace of his humanistic studies to the turmoil and acrimony of a controversy. Besides, Luther's methods often consisted in the vilest personal abuse.

The attitude of Erasmus towards the Reformation is clear. He held some opinions that would now be regarded as unorthodox, but this was at a time before the Council of Trent had settled by authoritative decision many questions that had previously been subjects of free discussion. But he never wavered in his allegiance to the Holy See.

A proof of this, not to be despised, is the fact that some years before his death Paul III. offered him the cardinal's hat ; and the further fact that he retained, during their lives, the friendship of such men as More and Fisher. In the words of Professor Jebb 'Erasmus was to the time of his death in 1536 as far from contemplating rebellion to Rome as were his two friends Colet and Sir Thomas More.'

J. F. D'ALTON.

THE PRAGMATIC VALUE OF THEISM

II.—THE THEISTIC HYPOTHESIS VERIFIED BY THE FACTS OF HUMAN EXPERIENCE

THE first step to be taken in the verification of a scientific hypothesis is to show that it is internally consistent. An inconsistent hypothesis is useless, for it means that somewhere or other a false assumption has been made, and until this has been set right there can be no hope of success in the process of experimental verification. As, then, we are going to use the Scientific Method in order to verify the hypothesis which we explained at considerable length in our last article, we must begin by showing that our hypothesis is consistent within itself before proceeding to show that it is consistent with the facts of human experience.

So far as the attributes of God are concerned this preliminary step is easy enough. Granted that God is the absolute and all-perfect Being, the attributes which we predicate of Him follow as a logical consequence. No limits can be assigned to what is *ex hypothesi* all-perfect. Hence God is infinite; and, if infinite, one, for the existence of another in the same absolute order as Himself would imply mutual limitation. Again, He is simple. In One who is of His very nature wholly actual and wholly perfect all ground for real distinction is excluded, since the latter presupposes either potentiality or divisibility, both of which imply composition and imperfection. But though simple, incomprehensible; for the infinite perfection of the absolute Being transcends the grasp of finite human minds, which can know Him only by way of analogy and inference. Immutable, too, since in what is already wholly actual there is neither room nor need for further development; while that perfection should decrease or fade away is altogether impossible in One whose very nature it is to

be. God's life, then, is a life eternally realized, without beginning and without end, an experience *tota simul* and complete in itself. God is not in time nor yet in space, for His infinite perfections exclude the possibility of measurement which time and space connote. Yet He has all the perfections that existents in time and space possess.

Goodness, beauty, happiness, justice, mercy, knowledge, love, power, every conceivable perfection is fully realized in God. *How* we cannot tell, for, as we have said, God's perfections transcend our comprehension. We cannot prove, therefore, the compatibility of these perfections *a priori*. But, on the other hand, we have no reason whatsoever for supposing that they are incompatible. Incompatibility in every case in which it occurs in our experience is due to the fact that finite perfections involve not only something positive but also a certain quantity or degree of the same, and hence the negation of that something in any other quantity or degree. Red and green, for instance, cannot exist together in the same part of the same object, because 'red' presupposes a definite rate of vibration in the molecules of the object concerned, and 'green' quite a different rate, which is therefore implicitly the negation of the first. In God, however, perfection is simple, absolute, and wholly positive, so that there is no conceivable reason why the different perfections which we predicate of Him should be incompatible. On the contrary, since goodness, beauty, knowledge, happiness, and will are found together in human beings, there would seem to be a *prima facie* probability that these perfections are of their very nature, and therefore even in their absolute form, compatible. Moreover, perfections as they exist in God are not really different at all, but at bottom are diverse aspects of one and the same self-subsistent Being.

So far, then, our hypothesis is quite consistent; but we have yet to deal with the far more difficult question of creation, and here I will ask the reader to bear in mind two very important considerations: first, that the God whose existence we are desirous of proving is not *any* God, still less a mere abstraction, but God *the Creator of this*

universe; and secondly, that the act of creation, like God Himself and all that pertains to God, is eternal.

God, our God, who is the one supreme and absolute Fact, eternally creates—so says our hypothesis—a universe which itself is not eternal but in time. Is there a contradiction here? Not at all. The predicate 'eternal' applies only to God, and signifies, as we have seen, that His life has neither beginning nor end, but is wholly realized *tota simul*. The predicate 'not-eternal' or 'temporal' applies only to the created universe, and signifies that the individuals which belong to that universe do not exist in this perfect way, but are finite in duration as in all their other perfections, and in any one of these respects might be either greater or less. 'Eternity' has nothing to do with the relation that holds between creatures and their Creator. That relation is essentially one of dependence, a dependence so peculiar and so complete that we apply to it a special term 'Creation.'

There can be no question, then, of creation involving any change in God, for creation is an eternal act. It is only the objects of this creative act that are in time. So, too, in regard to God's knowledge of the universe. Without successive acts of perception, abstraction, and reasoning He is fully conscious of all that is, and knows it as He knows Himself; without parts or organs of extension all things are present to Him, and He to them, in the very act by which He creates them. In the strict and literal sense of the term, there is no *fore* knowledge in God. He simply knows. What is future or past for us, because our finite consciousness is restricted to one small fraction of the time-series of the universe, for God is eternally present. He beholds the whole universe, past, present, and future, as it is. He sees Adam and Moses and Mary and Constantine and George V. and you and Antichrist and everybody else in a single act. He sees you not only as you are now, but in your birth, your infancy, your youth, your manhood, your death, your life in purgatory without a body, and your life in another world when your body shall be united to you again. All this He sees really as

it is, because it is all the product of His eternal will and act.

God also loves the universe, and His love, though like His knowledge, *qua* act, it is one with his very Being, is also, like His knowledge, diversified in the objects which it embraces, so that God may be truly said to love each of His creatures in proportion as it is good. Both these points, as well as the idea of creation itself, may perhaps be made clearer by the aid of an illustration taken from our finite experience.

'Creation' is a term which many declare to be unintelligible, yet it is a term which we employ even in common parlance to denote something that bears to God's creative act at least an outward semblance. Thus an artist is said to 'create' the idea which he expresses in painting or sculpture, the poet and the dramatist to 'create' the characters which are embodied in their written works. Doubtless the expression 'to create' is here used in a somewhat loose and analogous sense. The existence which an author gives to the characters of his poem or drama or novel is merely ideal; while even their nature is not wholly the product of his creative genius, in that it presupposes past experience of what is real independently of his creative act or will. The composition of a drama, too, is a process which takes place in time. It is only gradually that the dramatist develops in detail his general idea. On the other hand—and this is the point which bears upon our present problem—a drama is no mere aggregate of different individuals collected together from all manner of sources and combined in a single tale. It is essentially a living whole, and is conceived by its author as a whole. Vaguely at first perhaps, or better, schematically, every actor within the drama, each with his own peculiar individuality, is present to the mind of the dramatist as part of a single idea or plan. The actions of these *dramatis personae*, being conceived as real, are necessarily conceived as successive; but neither in that first intuitive glimpse which the author has of his general plan or design, nor yet when in retrospection he reviews his work as a whole, are these actions

successively conceived. The life-story of all the characters, diverse and numerous as they may be, is apprehended in a single act; and were it not for the possibility of such quasi-intuitive acts of conception and reflection, never would a drama be written. Without it each character would be a mere succession of disconnected events, and the whole at best a conglomeration of lifeless individuals. An intuitive grasp, not merely of a situation, but also of a whole period embracing many such situations, is as essential to the writing of drama and poetry as it is to the true appreciation of history. And it is precisely in these acts of what Kant calls 'perceptive intelligence,' so simple in themselves and yet so complex *terminative*, that the highest type of human activity is realized, and at the same time the nature of God's intelligence most clearly manifested.

But this is not all. No act of the human mind is purely intellectual. It is invariably accompanied by a peculiar emotional tone. Hence, when reflecting (say) on the series of events which led up to the murder of Thomas à Becket, we are inspired at once with disgust at the treachery of the king, admiration at the boldness and patient endurance of the Archbishop, and anger at the cruel violence of his assassins. So, too, in the case of our dramatist, the various characters he conceives must for him be living realities, and the emotional feelings which are in consequence evoked by their respective lines of conduct will combine to produce the emotional tone of those acts in which he views his drama as a whole. His emotional attitude, like his detailed conception of each individual character, will, as it were, be summed up in synthesis. True, in man's concept of a synthetic whole individual parts are but vaguely apprehended, and the emotions which each would evoke, if considered in comparative isolation, but dimly realized. Yet the general character of such a state of mind is sufficiently clear and sufficiently familiar, I think, for us to be able to gain therefrom some idea of how God in a single act knows the whole universe—and for that matter every possible universe—and at the

same time how His emotional attitude, so to speak, towards each individual within that universe, and again towards each act which that individual may perform, though one in itself, is really diverse *terminative*.

We do not contradict ourselves, therefore, when we say that God eternally knows and eternally loves the universe which He creates, really knows it in so far as it is real, and really loves it in so far as it is good. Neither His knowledge of His universe nor yet His 'emotional attitude' toward that universe involves any change in His being, since the universe is eternally present to His mind, and His acts, which at bottom are but diverse aspects of His Being, are diversified only in their objects.

But, it may be urged, if God really creates, really knows, and really loves the universe, even if His act is eternal and therefore involves no change, at least it must make a difference to Him somehow.

The force of this difficulty is undoubtedly very much weakened when the doctrine of creation is stated as we have stated it above. For clearly it cannot be objected against our hypothesis that creation must make a difference to God, if by this you mean that God must be different after creation from what He was before it, since, *ex hypothesi*, there is no before or after with God, who is eternal. Hence, whatever difference creation makes to Him must be an eternal difference which in no way involves any change. But is there any sense in speaking of an eternal difference? If we exclude all question of change or process in time is there any sense in asking whether God, having created, is different from what He would have been if He had not created? In what does this difference consist? Creation certainly does not add to God's happiness, for, since happiness arises from the possession of what is good, and since God of His very nature is infinitely good, *ex hypothesi* He must be infinitely happy. Nor can it add to His experience, for, again, *ex hypothesi* He knows all possible worlds. True, He knows them only as possible, whereas our world He knows as real; but this does not involve a difference in the content of His knowledge. It makes a difference only

to its objective reference. Nor, again, does creation add to God's perfection, for whatever perfection creation might add is already contained in His Omnipotence, whereby the sole condition required for the existence of any possible world is that He should will to create it. In finite beings we distinguish action from the capacity for action, because in finite beings there is a definite transition from potency to act, a transition which takes place in time and is conditioned both externally and internally by what is beyond the control of the creature's will. In God, however, there is no transition at all, and no condition over and above His eternal Omnipotence except the will to create.

Thus creation makes no difference either to God's perfection or to His happiness or to His experience: the *real* difference that it makes to reality in general seems to fall wholly outside God in that world which is the product of His creative act. And if there be any who, dissatisfied with this solution, still think that there must be some way in which creation makes a real though eternal difference to God, to such I would point out that this contention in no way militates against our hypothesis. For, as I have already indicated, the God whose existence we are concerned to prove is not any God, still less a mere abstraction or figment of our human minds, but precisely God, the Creator of our universe.

Our hypothesis, therefore, is internally consistent—a fact which itself must count strongly in its favour since consistency or the absence of frustration is one of the ideals which we consider both pragmatically and theoretically to be of the greatest possible value. Hence we may now proceed to verify that hypothesis by applying it to the broad facts of human experience.

What are these facts? Looked at from the standpoint of common sense we have, first of all, a system of individuals, each contingent and finite, yet differing vastly from its neighbours in character and structure. Some are human and personal; others of a lower type of consciousness; others again without consciousness at all, yet organic, living, and distinct from other things. At a lower level still indi-

viduality is less marked and becomes for practical purposes almost a matter of choice. Experience shows that things are divisible almost indefinitely not only in scientific theory but also in concrete fact. Individuality, too, is combined with interaction and interdependence, permanence with change; and the changes of which we have experience seem to follow definite and knowable laws. But law also has its opposite—freedom; for in man the automatic workings of physical forces and psychic instincts are to a large extent under the control of that higher principle which we call the Self. In man the blind necessity of nature gives place to a conscious striving after ideals. Impulses and tendencies no longer work automatically, but are directed by our human will to various human ends.

All this we explain by saying that God creates the universe, and creates it like to Himself. As God is one, so, too, every created existent is one. *Unum et ens convertuntur*. God, again, embraces within Himself all possible perfections, and similarly, though in a finite way, within the unity of the concrete individual there are manifold differences, qualities, or accidental forms, each of which is a manifestation of some Divine attribute or perfection. It is in man—next to the angels—that this manifestation is most complete; for man combines within himself intelligence, wisdom, knowledge, power, and purposive rational activity. But animals and plants, since they possess life, also manifest in an imperfect way the all-perfect life of God. Similarly in regard to material things, where the ‘cash-value’ of perfection lies in what it can do. It is by their activities that material things reveal their nature; for these activities, indefinitely various in form, produce in man a corresponding variety of sensation, whereby is manifested to him at once the beauty and the goodness of things. All these perfections proceed from God, who has them in an infinitely perfect way. All things whatsoever that finite creatures can do, He can do and does eternally; and the beauty and goodness which manifests itself in creatures in varying degrees is really a manifestation of the

beauty and goodness of God, in whom it exists in an absolute and infinite form.

Things, then, are individual in so far as they reproduce the individuality or unity of God, perfect in so far as they reproduce His perfection. But this reproduction, though it varies in degree, is always finite. No creature is one in the same sense that God is one—absolutely one and simple ; and no creature is absolutely perfect. The reason of this is apparent at once in our hypothesis. God creates the universe because He wishes His perfections not only to be manifested, but also to be recognized, and to be referred back to Him. Hence He does not create one individual, but many individuals, that each one that is endowed with intelligence and reason, recognizing an Other than himself, may recognize his own limitations. Nor does God give to any individual creature more than a finite degree of perfection, in order that rational creatures, conscious of their own finitude and imperfection, may come to the idea of One who is absolutely perfect and infinite.

Thus our hypothesis explains not only the existence of perfection within this finite world of ours, but also the existence of imperfection. It is inconceivable that God could create a being infinitely perfect ; for an infinite being would be of its very nature absolute, and therefore not a creature. At any rate God has not done so, and the reason appears to be fairly clear. The more perfect a being is, the greater is its obligation to God, and the greater its capacity for recognizing that obligation. Yet we know what happened in the case of the angels. Becoming self-satisfied and proud in their own excellence, they rebelled. So it is with us : in proportion as we realize our own power and our own perfection, physical and intellectual, we are inclined to fancy ourselves self-sufficient and to ignore our dependence on God. That one should take pleasure in one's own strength or beauty or mental capacity, and again that one should desire a recognition of these talents on the part of one's neighbour, is but natural. Indeed we have here, as before, but a reproduction of an analogous desire on God's part, which, as we have seen, is the ' motive ' or

'end' of creation. God is free to create or not to create, just as we are free either to seek or not to seek to give effect to our desires ; and as with God, so with us, the realization of our desires adds nothing to our intrinsic perfection ; though with us the recognition of our good qualities by others may confirm our belief in their reality, and thus incidentally add to our happiness. In this we differ from God, who has no need of such recognition. We differ also in another respect, namely, that God, being absolute and really self-sufficient, has a right to demand that He should be recognized as such, whereas our desire for recognition is legitimate and honourable only under certain conditions. All we can justly claim is that others should recognize us for what we are, creatures of God, having certain ' gifts ' of body and mind bestowed upon us by God, dependent upon Him throughout the whole course of our existence, and particularly for those actions which are meritorious in His sight only because they are performed under the promptings of supernatural grace.

Individuality, however, not only implies the synthesis of many perfections in one being : it has also a negative aspect. Individuals are not identical with, but distinct from, one another. This, indeed, is one of the most striking facts of our experience. By our natural common sense we recognize that persons and things are different from one another, distinct from one another, and to a large extent independent one of another ; while by our religious instincts we are prompted to recognize the existence of a yet higher being, distinct from ourselves, yet intimately bound up with our lives ; absolutely self-contained and *sui juris*, yet none the less the cause of our existence, the sustainer of our being, the protector of our rights and the source of our obligations ; truly worthy of our deepest reverence and our lifelong service, not only because He is our Maker, but also because He is our Ruler, a Ruler who will reward us according to our deserts, and from whom alone can we gain true peace and true happiness.

With the religious tendencies of our nature which find expression in this belief, our hypothesis is in perfect accord.

We affirm that God is a person *distinctus re et essentia* from this finite world, and yet out of pure love eternally creates, conserves, and co-operates with each individual existent within that world, existents which are, as common sense insists, really distinct from one another as well as from God their Creator.

Things within this universe have each their own nature and their existence, yet no one of them exists in isolation or is wholly independent of the rest. Each thing is what it is through the act of another in the process of time, and only through interaction with others can its nature develop or its existence be prolonged. This is another broad fact about our experience no less striking than the fact of individuality. The life of an individual without a parent could never begin, and in like manner without an environment could never be prolonged. Thus between the individuals of which this universe is composed there is a twofold dependence: a mutual dependence between individuals which exist at one and the same time, and a one-sided dependence as well in the individual itself, where accident depends upon substance and difference upon ground, as also in the relation between substances in the order of time, where each substance depends upon some previous substance or substances, through the action or interactions of which it began to be.

Again, therefore, facts about our universe which are patent and cannot be ignored bear out and reiterate what our hypothesis asserts, that we are one and all of us essentially dependent beings, presupposing and conditioned by the existence of an Other. Indeed, unless we explain this fact as we have endeavoured to explain it, on the supposition that all dependence ultimately comes to rest in God, who has created, not isolated individuals, but a system of individuals, it is impossible to explain it at all. That one-sided dependence which holds between successive events in the order of time must terminate somewhere, but where are we to make it terminate if not in God? We cannot postulate that the relation is reciprocal, for this it clearly is not. Are we, then, to explain the past by a prior past,

and so on *ad infinitum*? Or shall we turn the ends of our series round and make them meet in a circle? If we choose the former alternative, we shall find ourselves involved in what looks very like the absurdity of an indefinite number, for in any one section of our series successive events or periods of time are numerable, and yet that series, we say, is indefinitely prolonged! If the latter, we shall have a fully evolved and approximately perfect universe suddenly giving place to one at the lowest stage of development, and beginning its process of evolution all over again. In either case we meet with difficulties of no slight moment which our hypothesis escapes. For in our view the universe is not a mere series of events indefinitely extended in space and time, but a definite system of individuals each with its own extension and its own duration. These individuals, if we consider only their duration, are arranged, so to speak, in parallel series, each series running throughout the whole time-length of the universe. As individuals they are also numerable; and hence to our series there is both a first and a last. The last can be accounted for, partially at least, by that which precedes, and so on from future to past, until we come to the first set of individuals or events with which the universe began. Here we must stop, for there is *ex hypothesi* nothing prior in the order of time upon which these can depend. As, however, these 'first' existents are clearly not self-subsistent, since they belong to a universe of contingent beings and are themselves the first in a process of change, we are forced to postulate an Other, outside the universe, and therefore out of time, to which their existence is due. That Other in our hypothesis is God; and it is to the act by which these 'first' existents in our time-series come into being that the term 'creation' is by theologians specially applied.

Here, then, lies one of the principal values of our hypothesis. It explains the beginning of the time-series. But there is in that series another feature that no less urgently demands explanation; and here again our hypothesis fits the facts. I refer to the phenomenon of change without which there would be no time-series at all, for

it is by change that successive events in that series are indicated.

According to the principle of Causality the explanation of any one event in our series is to be looked for in preceding events. But prior events do not explain wholly events that follow. They explain them only in so far as they contain them already, at least *in potentia*. They do not explain how what was previously potential comes now to be actual. The 'new' quality by which a consequent is distinguished from its antecedent is, as such, peculiar to that consequent, and hence cannot be wholly accounted for by antecedents. For it is fairly obvious, I think, that a thing cannot cause, or give, what it itself does not possess. Change, or transition *de potentia ad actum*, cannot be due solely either to internal forces of development, or to action *ab extra*, or to both combined, since, if the causes of succeeding events are wholly contained in their antecedents, they ought to pass into effect instantaneously, i.e., the new feature that *de facto* is only gradually evolved ought to be already fully realized in its cause.

A series of changes, then, cannot be completely accounted for by anything intrinsic to the series. We must appeal to something without. That something our hypothesis supplies in God, who concurs with 'secondary' or created causes, and so enables them to produce their natural effects, or—more accurately—who in creating the universe gives to each individual an existence or a life that is extended in time as it is extended in space, an existence or life comprising different stages of development, arranged in an order such that each successive stage presupposes for its evolution not merely dependence upon God, but also immanent activity within the individual and interaction between it and its environment.

Interaction, and that which interaction implies—relation and systematic connexion—next claim our attention. It is a fact that all existents are individuals; but individuality, as we have seen, exists side by side, with interaction and interdependence, as permanence exists side by side with change. The universe is no mere aggregate of

otherwise isolated individuals. It is not a flat mosaic, but a system, an organized coherent totality or whole. Indeed, if the postulates of science are to be accepted as literally true, no change can take place in one individual without affecting in some degree, whether appreciable or not, every other individual throughout the universe. In any case it is certain that changes are produced in one thing by the action of another.

But if each thing has its own existence and nature, how comes this about? Interaction is *pro tanto* a negation of individuality. Hence to affirm that the universe is a system of perfect individuals, each containing within itself, quite independently of any other being, its own complete *ratio essendi*, is to deny that these individuals have anything to do with one another, and so to deny that they form a system or universe at all. Nor yet, on the other hand, can the universe itself as a system of interacting individuals be the ultimate fact. For in that case nothing has in itself, *qua* individual, its own *ratio essendi*, since *ex hypothesi* things are connected and interact. If the universe is a system at all, the individuals that compose it must have a common source either in a single ground or in a single cause. Conjunctions as well as disjunctions are real, interaction as well as individuality and independence; and things, since they are thus really related one to another and together form a real system, must in some way really be one. The production of motion in one thing by impact with another, the conjunction of two motions in a third resultant motion that is neither one or the other, the fact of chemical composition and decomposition whereby by conjoining two substances under certain conditions a third substance is produced having properties very different from those of either of the conjoining pair, anabolism and katabolism, assimilation, organic growth, all of which are conditioned *ab extra*, unmistakably point to the fact that somehow or other the universe must be one. A Radical Pluralism is utterly impossible. Even Professor James recognizes this at times, and, to save himself from it, is forced to postulate a world-

soul, or an *Empfindungseinheit*, or some other kind of absolute, in order to bind together what otherwise would be discrete and wholly independent, and therefore contrary to the facts of experience.

The universe must somehow be one if things are connected together, as they obviously are; and this being so, we have but two alternatives: either Monism or Creationism, either an immanent Ground or a transcendent Cause. Of these two hypotheses we have chosen the latter, because the hypothesis of a transcendent God who is above all things yet the sustainer of all things, while free from the contradictions to which Monism inevitably leads, affords us here, as it has done all along, an adequate explanation of the facts which confront us in the course of our experience.

God is one, infinite, absolute; and because He is one, infinite, and absolute, He sees not only an infinity of individuals which reproduce, each in its own degree, its all-perfect nature, but also an infinity of ways in which these individuals may be combined. God knows the relations of these individuals one to another. He knows them as a system, or better as systems, each of which is capable of actual existence, provided He will it so to exist. And of these systems, as we have seen, He selects one, which He creates, and which, in the very act in which He creates it, is eternally present to Him as a real universe, a real system of inter-related, interdependent, and interactive beings.

Thus the universe is not an individual, but a system of individuals resembling one another, because all created by, and in the image of, one Supreme Being; related to one another, interacting one with another, and together forming one universe, because, though individual, their individuality is finite, and hence is capable of further development, and because, as they are created by a single act, so they are the expression of a single plan or design.

But a plan or design is something more than a mere ideal arrangement of parts standing in definite relations one to another. As we understand it, it is a system constructed according to definite laws. And this, too, holds

in the case of creation. God does not select the individuals which He creates, haphazard or anyhow. He chooses individuals between which action and reaction takes place in a certain definite way, and, though the individuals vary, the way in which they act and interact under similar conditions is constant. The 'Laws of Nature,' which it is the aim both of Science and of Metaphysics to discover, are at bottom nothing more nor less than the principles, more or less fundamental, according to which God has constructed our universe, principles which, if I may so put it, are prior in the purpose of God to the particular individuals in which they are manifested.

The highest and most universal of these principles or laws is that of Causality. Every event must have a cause from which it proceeds, and which thus far it manifests and reproduces. This law is itself clearly a finite reproduction of the supreme relation of the creature to its Creator—the relation of one-sided dependence of effect on active principle or agent. Another law of scarcely less importance in these days of evolutionary theories is that every being tends to realize the potentialities of its own nature—a law which again in a finite way expresses the nature of Him who is eternally self-realized.

It would be idle to attempt to reconstruct the universe *a priori*, or to endeavour to show in detail how it manifests the nature of Him by whom it was first conceived. Nevertheless it is something that we should know the universe to have been constructed according to a rational plan in which some principles are prior in the natural order as they are prior also in the intention of God. And for our purpose this is sufficient, since it accounts for the fact that, as our knowledge of the universe advances, we recognize more and more clearly that all action and interaction which takes place therein does so according to definite and knowable laws. As such, these laws do not exist in reality. They belong to the plan of the universe as it is conceived in the mind of God. But they are realized, manifested, or embodied in concrete particulars, and may be recognized therein by rational beings, just as Sir Christopher Wren's

plan is embodied in St. Paul's Cathedral, and is reproduced and recognized in our guide-books.

To law is opposed freedom—that noble attribute peculiar to rational beings whereby they seek to realize a purpose, or do not seek to realize it, and again seek to realize it by this means or that means, as they choose. To act without a motive is impossible, and with us a motive or impulse may sometimes be so strong that of its own intrinsic force it compels us to act. *Our* freedom is limited, and varies in degree. But in a truly perfect being no motive however strong, no idea however attractive, can issue into act without the consent of that being freely given and able to be withheld. God is free in this fuller sense, and because He is also omnipotent He is able to create beings like to Himself in this power of self-determination. Whence follows a curious consequence: the purpose of creation, expressed in the nature of the beings God creates, may or may not be realized in a world where freedom exists, according as those beings who are free shall choose to further or to thwart its realization. To act contrary to one's nature, to refuse to obey laws which follow from the very nature of one's existence as moral agents living in community, and subject to the dominion of God, this is sin, and sin is the distortion of the plan according to which God has constructed the universe.

From sin, in our hypothesis, all other evils follow. Hence the *possibility* of evil is a necessary consequence of the fact that God is able to create beings capable of recognizing the purpose of their existence, and yet free to ignore it, if they will, and to substitute another in its stead. In other words, there are two types of world eternally possible. In one the natural purpose of creation is realized, either automatically, so to speak, and of necessity, or by the free choice of rational beings within that world. In the other the purpose of creation is not realized owing to the refusal of free agents to co-operate in the work of God's design. But in the latter case God may either leave His creatures in the semi-chaotic condition to which their refusal to carry out the natural law of their being has

reduced them, or He may remedy the partial frustration of His original design, and by supernatural means restore order where order has ceased to be. Hence there is a third type of world in which the purpose of creation, though not realized in precisely the way that nature demands, so to speak, is none the less realized in a higher and more perfect way. And it is a world of this third type that God has chosen to create.

It is impossible to deny that evil exists in this world of ours. Sin, suffering, error, disease, in greater or less degree, are the lot of every human being. And this fact urgently demands an explanation of any hypothesis that claims to account for the origin of the universe. How are we to explain it in our hypothesis? Briefly the answer is this: All evil is the consequence of sin—a statement which is borne out by human experience, probably by our personal experience; and the possibility of sin follows from the possibility of freedom in finite contingent beings, who, recognizing their obligations, may yet decline to fulfil them. That God should be able to create a world in which sin and evil exist is a consequence of His omnipotence; that He should actually create such a world is due to His own free choice.

This choice of a world in which evil *de facto* exists is, it is alleged, incompatible with the all-perfect nature we have ascribed to God. Either, say the opponents of Theism, God could not help Himself and so is not omnipotent, or else He deliberately chose evil and so is not infinitely good. I accept the latter alternative with a modification, but deny the consequence. To create a world in which there are those who refuse obedience to laws imposed upon them by their Creator no more casts a slur on God's omnipotence, provided He be capable of vindicating His claim to obedience, than does the liberty allowed to individuals in a civil community cast a slur upon the authority of the State which is able to punish them should they infringe its laws. Nor does the existence of sin and the evils that follow from sin derogate from the goodness of God, any more than does the abuse of civil liberty derogate from the goodness of a

government which, by granting such liberty, is responsible for the occasion of its abuse. God does not create the world *because* of the evil that is in it. Rather He creates it in spite of that evil. True, in a sense He is responsible for the world and all that is in it, since without His creative act such a world would never exist. But He does not will evil as such. His primary purpose in creating the world is, as we have seen, that each of its inhabitants should, by living according with the law of its nature, whether physical or moral, attain to the full perfection of its being. That in our world as created by Him these laws are frequently violated, and the purpose of creation thus partially frustrated, God sees; and also in some sense wills, i.e., wills *consequenter*—conditionally on man's free choice—not *antedenter*—or unconditionally. This being so, were it not that God has provided a remedy for the evil that is in the world, its existence would undoubtedly be more difficult to reconcile with His goodness. But a remedy has been provided, a remedy so wonderful that the state of things which it brings about far exceeds in perfection any to which a creature of its own natural powers could attain.

It is quite a mistake, therefore, to think that it would have been better for the universe had God created it such that man, freely obeying God's laws, should avoid all sin, and so escape its consequence, suffering. To compare such a universe with ours is utterly impossible. The two universes are totally different. Indeed, the whole question as to the best possible universe seems to me to be vitiated by the fundamental fallacy of supposing that universes can be compared as we compare in the abstract different degrees of one and the same perfection. Our universe is what it is, and were it otherwise it would not be our universe nor should we be ourselves. Take away all sin, and in one sense the universe would be better; but if you do this, you must take away also the remedy of sin, the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the redeeming grace of God's Son whereby we are sanctified and become co-heirs with Him to the Kingdom of our Father, to which in our natural state, however perfect, we have not the slightest claim.

Truly, then, does the Church say that sin is a *felix culpa*—a fault which, however unhappy in its natural consequences, is immeasurably happy in the consequences which God produces and of which it is the occasion. These consequences, moreover, are consequences for each one of us, if we choose to avail ourselves of them. The fruits of the Incarnation, grace, peace, happiness even amid suffering, and a life of eternal joy, these are the lot of anyone who is willing to accept them. The world is evil no longer unless we choose to make it so.

No one of the broad facts of our experience, then, conflicts with our hypothesis, not even that most terrible fact, the existence of evil and sin. All find an explanation therein, and work together in confirmation of the whole. Assume the existence of God, and the why and wherefore of the universe becomes at once clear. Deny it, and the universe is little more than a medley of mysterious phenomena, a riddle which defies solution. Other attempts there are to solve it ; but, in order to do so, they select some facts, interpreting them as they will regardless of the judgments of common sense, and ignore others entirely or reduce them to mere appearance. Contradiction is the inevitable result. The hypothesis of Theism is the only hypothesis that is self-consistent, and at the same time borne out by the facts of human experience. That it is also satisfactory pragmatically in that in it our needs and our ideals find a promise of complete realization, it will be our endeavour to show in our concluding article.

LESLIE J. WALKER, S.J.

THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE IN PORTUGAL

THE official journal in Lisbon has now published the decree separating Church and State. It is a document of 195 articles which enter minutely into every aspect of the question. Anxiously awaited by all, Radicals as well as Conservatives, the impression which it has produced is great.

Before describing the new law, it is indispensable for a better understanding of it by the reader that I explain the union which existed between Church and State until the proclamation of the Republic. That system was called into existence eighty years ago by triumphant constitutionalism. The constitutionalists were, I need not remark, the adherents of Dom Pedro IV. The partisans of Dom Miguel pretended, on the other hand, like the Spanish Carlists, to a monopoly of Catholicism and ultramontanism. They styled themselves 'defenders of our Holy Religion,' and called their opponents 'freemasons' and 'malhados' (constitutionalists).

It was the 'malhados' who triumphed. They could not, however, impose on the country, like the dictators of to-day, an official dechristianization. They did the next worst thing, however, by establishing a union of Church and State which made the Catholic clergy unduly subservient to Government influences. Various concordats were negotiated with Rome, all of them tending to maintain the predominance of the civil power and the special rights which, centuries before, the Portuguese Crown had obtained in one way or another. These concordats concentrated in the hands of the sovereign the rights of presentation to all ecclesiastical benefices from bishoprics to the humblest posts occupied in the churches by laymen.

They also placed at his disposal the confiscated goods of the congregations, so that he might organize a general

fund for the Church. They maintained the Portuguese religious protectorate in the East with the royal right of appointing Bishops in the dioceses established in British India, in Southern China, and in various other regions formerly subject to the Portuguese Crown. In exchange the State guaranteed the clergy a decent allowance, gave them special privileges and assured the ecclesiastical discipline and the religious unity of the country.

The Catholic influence was so profound that the legislators were unable, finally, to attain the ends which they had proposed to themselves. Mousinho da Silveira, Prime Minister in 1834, was unable to establish an obligatory civil register owing to the opposition of the clergy, who derived the most of their income from their monopoly of the marriage register. The grant of religious liberty was rendered difficult by the constitutional charta itself, which allowed only to foreigners the public exercise of any non-Catholic religions, and which decreed that the houses in which the exercises of such religions were practised should not have, exteriorly, the appearance of churches.

The congregations, dissolved in 1834, returned to the country little by little, and reconstituted themselves with the connivance of the authorities, who found that it would be difficult to enforce the law without arousing serious opposition throughout the country. They had also to reckon with the Bishops, who had the right to a seat in the Upper House as life senators.

This situation of Roman Catholic preponderance possessed all the inconveniences of any kind of power largely exercised without competition. The clergy began to grow slack. The ecclesiastical career became, not an apostolate, but a profitable profession. The clergy became unduly anxious for the maintenance of a 'state of things' which, though tending to weaken the Church and to undermine the faith of its children, guaranteed many privileges and benefits to the ministers of the national religion. Against this decadence of the religious spirit were raised, during these last few years, authoritative voices. In some instances the parish priest himself, oblivious of his sacred mission, completely

given over to politics, dependent on the Minister to whom, and not to his Bishop, he owed his nomination (for the civil power monopolized the rights of the Bishop), was the principal agent in this slow erosion of the national religion, an erosion which was cleverly exploited and utilized by Freethinkers.

A large body of well-known Catholics, among them several ecclesiastics, had studied the whole question and come to the conclusion that only one measure could put a stop to the progress of the evil. That was an amicable separation of Church and State. These men were influenced to a certain extent by the example of Brazil, where the separation had been effected in a loyal and honourable spirit. Under the Empire the Brazilian clergy were in a state of corruption, and the Brazilian laity were a flock of superstitious-minded people with no real faith to speak of. When the Republic came, and with it the separatist *régime*, the clergy gained in strength and in discipline. They acquired all the virtues of men who are obliged to struggle for existence. They distinguished themselves by magnificent works, which will consolidate their influence beyond the reach of destruction.

All this explains the motives of those Portuguese Catholics who, when the Republic was proclaimed, accepted without antipathy or resistance the idea of separation under the impression that it would be a separation such as had taken place in Brazil. Unfortunately it is only by way of sarcasm that the new dictatorial law can be denominated a 'separation' of Church and State. Separation signifies liberation, restitution to each of the separated parties of the portion of liberty surrendered for the sake of the compromise called union.

Now the present Portuguese law of separation, drawn up as it is in a strictly sectarian spirit, is not separation but persecution. The State in effect liberates itself from all the compromises of the concordatorial *régime* which has existed up to the present, but while declining to be bound by any of the duties imposed by these compromises, it does not abandon any of the rights which it wrongfully acquired

over the Church. Indeed, it claims new rights as vexatary as they are oppressive. Instead of limiting itself to denouncing the Concordat, already fallen into universal contempt, it makes no secret of its intention, already announced in public by the Minister of Justice, 'to completely extinguish the Catholic religion in the country within two generations.'

A perusal of the law shows that the Government has no mind to concede to the Catholic Church the liberty which it enjoys in all free countries, even in Protestant countries. A Church independent of the State is a Church in a condition to exercise that influence which she exercises in all countries where liberty is accorded to her. To justify this oppression, this right of examination and of degrading supervision, which is exercised over the most sacred religious ceremonies, the Provisional Government does not hesitate to *promise* a subsistence to the present clergy by a system of pensions which is a terrible weapon of domination and of corruption.

The State concedes to the clergy the liberty of exercising their functions on conditions prescribed not by the Holy See but by the Minister of Justice. Salaries will be paid to all the ecclesiastics who at present occupy a position in the Church. But these pensions will be suppressed in the case of clergymen who do not bend to the will of the Government, who are suspected of sympathy for the late *régime*, or who, in any other manner whatsoever, incur the hatred or suspicion of the Republicans. The clergy will thus be in a precarious situation, completely subordinated to the State, even in regard to their spiritual ministrations.

In exchange for the little that it gives, the State claims to exercise over the Church all the rights and privileges which have ever, so far, been claimed by the most grasping despots. Religious instruction is now regarded as a public cult. Schools, convents of nuns who assist the poor or nurse the sick, even private institutions which are maintained by Catholic confraternities, must be accessible to the public at all hours as if they were churches. The Catholic corporations, which have been organized with the object of looking after religious affairs in each parish, must present the Minister

of Justice with the most minute accounts of their activity, under pain of dissolution and the interdiction of public worship in the locality. The churches will be 'lent' by the Government to the Catholic body for nothing during the space of ninety-nine years, after which they will come into the possession of the State without the latter being obliged to pay any indemnity whatsoever. This clause not only refers to the churches now existing, but to all those which shall have been constructed by private initiative during that period.

To effect the de-Christianization of the new generation, several clauses are introduced which do not exist even in French legislation. For example, youthful believers (using the word to designate the laymen of any religious persuasion or their children) must not assist at any religious exercise during school-hours. The object of this clause is to prevent the teaching of the catechism, so necessary from a moral point of view for the young. In case this article is infringed, both the father of the child and the parish priest are severely punished for disobedience.

All external cult is forbidden, but the administration can authorize, for a limited period, the holding of processions in places where this custom is deeply rooted. This is a concession to certain parts of the country where Catholicism is very strong, and where the prohibition of processions would provoke tumults and reaction. But if the law thus conives temporarily at the holding of religious processions in certain districts, sectarian intolerance will as a matter of fact prohibit them. In Buarcos, near Figueira da Foz, a procession was recently authorized by the administrator of the Council, but the local Republicans stoned the procession, broke it up, and destroyed some of the images that were carried in it. The same thing happened in Guimarães. It is clear that these disturbances, provoked exclusively by the anti-clericals, will lead to the immediate prohibition of all external cult in these two districts. The new law expressly prohibits religious funerals outside the precincts of the cemetery. No priest can accompany, even as a private individual, the corpse of one of his parishioners from the house to the grave.

The economic side of the decree is indicative of the same narrow spirit of intolerance. I have already pointed out that all the temples and other edifices appertaining to the Church, even those which are private property made over to the Church by the faithful, revert to the State, being expropriated without payment. The State permits the carrying on of religious ceremonies in these buildings, *but only to an extent that is strictly necessary*; and as it rests entirely with the State to define the meaning of the phrase 'strictly necessary,' it follows that the civil authorities can limit as much as they like the number of churches existing in the country. The law completely secularizes the churches in process of construction, and the churches which belonged to the Jesuits. The latter have already been applied by the State to various secular uses.

Some years ago the Portuguese, in order to commemorate the fiftieth year of the dogmatic definition of the Immaculate Conception, opened a public subscription for the construction of a votive church. This subscription amounts to £200,000 sterling, and a sumptuous monument-church is already being built in Lisbon. In the name of liberty the State now seizes this uncompleted church and all of the building fund. It makes no inquiry into the rights of those who contributed this money.

All pious legacies are annulled and incorporated in the property of the State. In future no citizen can bequeath for any religious purpose more than the tenth part of his disposable property, and his bequest cannot be paid for a longer period than thirty years. This arrangement will inevitably reduce the income of the present clergy and force them to live on their mediocre State pensions. As for the clergy of the future, they will have to face an impossible economic situation, fatal to all religious vocations. Humanly speaking, Senhor Affonso Costa, the author of this law, was right when he said that in two generations there will not remain in Portugal a vestige of Catholicity.

Articles 148 to 152 of the new law make this still clearer. They aim at a wholesale corruption of the clergy. They declare that the pensions paid by the State to the actual

clergy will still be paid even when a clergyman is suspended by his ecclesiastical superiors, or has voluntarily abandoned the exercise of his spiritual functions. The State offers its protection to priests who marry, enrolls them in its list of public functionaries as *attachés*, and appoints them to the first suitable vacancies in preference to other candidates. The Catholic priest who marries obtains thereby the right of leaving all or part of his pension to his wife and children. This is a real incitement to clerical corruption and to desertions, which have up to the present been rare.

The ecclesiastical pensions are not granted on a uniform basis, but fixed by a local commission, which takes into consideration the probable yield of the parish and the value of the padre's personal belongings. Each parish priest is obliged by law to declare the amount of his savings and must furnish officially full accounts of everything that he receives as payment for any kind of work, even work which has no connexion with his sacred ministry. This, I need hardly say, is despotism carried to its furthest limits.

In the matter of education the State does not abandon any of the rights which the Concordat gave it, though it releases itself from the obligation of fulfilling the duties which the Concordat imposes on it. In the first place, it arbitrarily reduces from twelve to five the number of seminaries existing in the country. And these five seminaries which are indisputably the property of the Church, are 'ceded' gratuitously to the Church by the State for ecclesiastical instruction during the space of five years. At the end of that period the Catholics must pay the State for the use of these edifices which they originally built with their own money!

The Republic maintains all the articles of the legislation at present in force regarding the intervention of the State in the working of the seminaries, in the nomination and approval of the professors, and in the choice of the books of instruction. Article 109 of the law amplifies this intervention of the State until it embraces the nomination of sacristans and other servants in the churches! As to the seminarists, who have hitherto gone through their prepara-

tory courses in the small seminaries, they must in future complete these courses in the State-owned educational establishments, wherein atheism is notoriously rampant. This is equivalent to a sentence of death on all vocations to the priesthood.

Lest perchance some hope might be left for Catholicism in the Portuguese clergymen educated abroad, those clergymen are prohibited from exercising their functions in any part of the country. There are many Portuguese priests exercising parochial functions who, for various reasons, have received Holy Orders in Spain or in Rome. In the same way there are in London many English Roman Catholic priests who have been ordained in Lisbon and in Rome, and there are in Ireland very many priests who have been ordained in France, Italy, and elsewhere. The Portuguese priests who have been ordained abroad must now emigrate or abandon their calling, for they will not be permitted to exercise clerical functions. The same rule applies to foreign priests passing through Portugal, even visiting Lisbon or Oporto from a passing steamship. No matter what nationality or what religion they belong to they will not be allowed to say Mass or hold any kind of service on Portuguese territory. If they do, they will expose to punishment not only themselves but also the incumbent of the church in which they officiate.

It is officially announced that the embassy to the Vatican will not be suppressed, but only reduced to a simple legation. The Portuguese Republic does not wish to sever relations with the Holy See, principally on account of the Portuguese protectorate in the Orient. This protectorate submits to the spiritual influence of Portugal the greater part of India, and the Portuguese Government has consequently the right of nominating Roman Catholic Bishops in several dioceses on British territory. If in France the Separatists were sufficiently stupid to renounce, to the profit of Germany, the Roman Catholic protectorate in the East, the Portuguese Separatists have been wise enough to retain this means of influence and strength. But will they retain it? Very probably not, seeing that the Separation

Law, which was not discussed with Rome, virtually destroys the Concordat, and alters completely the relations between the State and the Roman Curia.

O Dia, a newspaper which is above suspicion in this matter owing to the vigorous anti-clerical campaigns which it has carried on in the past, and to its most violent defence in the present of the supremacy of the civil over the religious power—even the *Dia* protests against the Separation Law, which takes, it says, from the Church what legitimately belongs to it and what individuals have from time to time given it.

The same journal adds that

“The State does not separate itself from the Church. It enters into the Church, expropriates its property, prevents it from receiving legacies from its children, subjects it to a system of studied degradation, exercises in places which Catholics regard as sacred an impertinent police and fiscal activity over the form of the Divine Services and the hours at which they are to be held.”

FRANCIS M'CULLAGH.

A RECENT CONFIRMATION OF THE SCAPULAR TRADITION

B EING away from home, and occupied with some rather pressing work in another line of study, I have not yet found time to put together in readable form the criticisms which Father Rushe's March article on the evidence for the Scapular revelation has suggested to me. But meanwhile there has come to hand a new utterance of this same Père Marie-Joseph du Sacré Cœur, whose uncompromising language in condemnation of his confrère, Father Zimmerman, I quoted in my last article. This time there is nothing in the words used by Père Marie-Joseph which could offend the most fastidious. If I complain, it is not of what he says, but of what he leaves unsaid, and that for reasons which will appear directly.

The question concerns a new piece of evidence regarding the history of the Scapular devotion, which is in any case of a very interesting character. Writing in July, 1904, I remarked :—

It would be interesting if Father Zimmerman would make a little more clear for us the exact epoch at which the wearing of two small pieces of brown cloth first came into fashion and was treated as an outward sign of participation in the spiritual privileges of the Order. . . . Even in Bale's time (*circa* 1525) his manner of speaking of those 'rascals, religious only in outward appearance, who not only promise themselves salvation, but, for the sake of gain, promise it to all others also, who, in the moment of death, are covered with the *habit* (quotquot in mortis articulo fuerint contacti habitu)' seems quite inconsistent with the idea of any general adoption of the two little fragments of cloth.

The new piece of evidence does not fully answer the question, but it clearly indicates a line for future research. It does something to span the gulf between the voluminous Carmelite habit and our familiar object of Catholic devotion, As the Editor of the I. E. RECORD knows, I had intended to

discuss this new evidence in commenting on Father Rushe's second article, but seeing that the principal text has just been printed in the Carmelite *Etudes*,¹ I venture to treat the matter separately and at once. In the April number of the periodical just named the second article consists of a short note by Père Marie-Joseph, accompanied by a well-executed photographic facsimile of a page of manuscript. The note is headed: 'Documentary Proof of the Devotion of the Carmelite Order for the Holy Scapular,' and runs as follows:—

We give on the opposite page a photograph of folio 33 v^o. of a Latin manuscript of the Vatican Library, No. 3991. It is a page of the manuscript Constitutions of the Carmelites of the year 1369, from the twelfth chapter: *De receptione Novitiorum et modo inducendi eos*. The following is an exact transcription of the passage which here concerns us:—

'Item statuimus quod quicumque ingrediens ordinem nostrum ad sui instantiam vel de voluntate amicorum suorum vel parentum, apportet secum et habeat in propria forma, et non in pecunia vel valore, lectum suum antequam ad ordinem admittatur, quod si non fecerit vel non habuerit, ut dictum est, recipiens ipsum ad ordinem solvere teneatur. *Habeat etiam cum rauba sua parvum scapulare cum tunica ad jacendum.*'

Thus the Constitutions of 1369 require the postulant to have, together with his robe (*rauba*), a little scapular with a tunic to wear during the night.

It is easy to see the importance of this passage, which gives proof of the veneration in which the Scapular was held a hundred years after the death of St. Simon Stock, seeing that all members of the Order, even the postulants, were bound to wear it both by day and night. And this has remained obligatory, even though the religious are no longer required to retain their entire habit in bed.

Here, then, we have a substantial confirmation of the well-known text of the Constitutions of 1324: 'De Dormitione Fratrum. Rubr. vi. Statuimus quod Fratres in tunica et scapulari dormiant supracincti,' which can only be understood

¹ This new periodical, the first number of which was referred to in my last article, has slightly changed its title. The first number (February) was called *Etudes de Notre Dame de Mont Carmel*; it is now styled *Etudes Carmelitaines*.

of the inner tunic and the little scapular specially intended for the night, which we still use.

And from all this no vestige of doubt can remain regarding the very special devotion in which the Scapular was held by the Order only two years before the apparition of the Blessed Virgin to Pope John XXII. and the publication of the Sabbatine Bull.

P. M.-J.

Père Marie-Joseph does not tell us by whom this most interesting discovery was made. I must assume that he did not know, for assuredly if he did know it would be hard to justify his suppression of the fact that the person who first drew attention to this document was no other than Father Benedict Zimmerman himself. As the proofs of this are in my possession, I regard it as nothing short of a duty in conscience to make them known as soon as possible.

Having written, in July, 1904, the article already referred to in criticism of Father Zimmerman's defence of the Scapular revelation, I came to exchange some few private letters with my whilom opponent, and though I have not now the letters at hand I have the clearest recollection that Father Zimmerman, while showing a remarkably open and candid mind towards any adverse evidence, was always anxious to defend the Scapular, and usually claimed more weight for his documents than I from my point of view felt myself quite able to concede. In 1907 he was working in the libraries of Rome, and from there sent me a letter which I have fortunately preserved. In this epistle, now nearly four years old, he announces his discovery of the document which Père Marie-Joseph publishes in April, 1911, without any reference to Father Zimmerman, and as a sequel to the article in which he described the latter as the relentless enemy of the Carmelite Scapular. Under these circumstances I make no apology for printing Father Zimmerman's letter exactly as I received it:—

39 CORSO D'ITALIA,
ROME.

June 22, 1907.

DEAR REV. FATHER,

In the event of your noticing or reviewing my *Monumenta*, the fifth instalment of which ought to reach you in a few days,

I think it only fair to tell you of something I have found concerning the Scapular question, and throwing, as it appears to me, a certain amount of light on the subject. MS. Lat. Vatic. 3991 contains our Constitutions revised in 1369 by the then General, John Ballistarii (1358-74). The volume was written somewhat later, viz., in 1398, which is not surprising, considering that this revision was in force until 1462, and that, of course, every house of the Order was in need of a copy. This particular copy has been at the Vatican at least from the days of Paul V., whose arms it bears, and was known to Lezana, who appears never to have taken the trouble of reading it, or he must have found the passage I am going to quote. Moreover, a complete copy was taken in the seventeenth century, which is now in the archives of the Calced Carmelites, and which I have seen. The passage in question is there to be found in its proper place, but for some unaccountable reason nobody seems to have understood its importance. I may mention that in looking through the volume I had no idea of seeking for anything concerning the Scapular question. I only wanted to know what changes in our Constitutions had taken place between 1324, the date of those I have printed in the *Monumenta*, and 1369, the date of the volume before me. I found that Ballistarii inserted in their respective places all the decisions of the General Chapters between 1327 and 1366, and that he rearranged the whole work after a more logical plan. But I also found that in a great many places he is far more explicit than either the old Constitutions or the acts of the Chapters, so that many things are better explained or more fully detailed.

To these belongs a passage in the Rubric on the reception of Novices, which is the XIIth (fol. 33 v.). In *Monumenta*, pages 141-2, you will find a decision of the Chapter of 1342, prescribing that a postulant must bring with him *lectisternia*, which I take to mean his own blankets, &c. Ballistarii gives the passage thus: '*Item statuimus quod quicumque ingrediens ordinem nostrum ad sui instantiam, &c., Habeat etiam cum rauba sua parvum scapulare cum tunica ad jacendum.*' The *tunica*, as is explained elsewhere, is merely a kind of a night-shirt. But the *parvum scapulare* is interesting. Here is a postulant who comes to the convent to be received into the Order, and in due time to be clothed. Yet he is supposed to bring with him not only what manner of ordinary clothing everybody requires by day or by night, but also a *parvum scapulare*. There can be no possible doubt about the authenticity of the passage or about the date.

It certainly proves that about the middle of the fourteenth century some people who did *not* wear the Carmelite habit, since they did not yet belong to the Order, were supposed to be already in possession of a scapular which they wore at night-time. There seems to be no reason to think that they could have got it from the Benedictines, Dominicans, or Servites, but I take it that it was very much like the Scapular of the Carmelites, only smaller. It also shows that some importance was attached to it, for a Scapular is, unlike a night-shirt, not one of those things that everybody is accustomed to wear at night-time. How much or how little importance was attached to it, and on what precise grounds, does not appear, and I for one have a horror of speculations, but the fact is there. I must also mention that at a further revision of the Constitutions, in 1462, this passage must have disappeared, for I do not remember having seen it. I copied the whole of these last-named Constitutions from a MS. at the British Museum, and although I have no access, just at present, to my copy, I am sure this passage, had it been there, could not have escaped my notice. You will see that in my *Monumenta*, I say that in 1430, date of Grossi's *Viridarium*, the custom of wearing a scapular independently of the habit, was *certainly* fairly widely spread, and that *probably* it went back to the fourteenth century. This new passage shows that in the middle of the fourteenth century it certainly *did* exist. I am not prepared to say more. Some people thought me too advanced in rejecting what I do reject; others, too conservative in not rejecting more. All I can say is, that my new find justifies me on both sides. I also feel somewhat satisfied that it should have been left to me to find this passage. Lezana and Co. would have made too much of it. I have shown it to Father Ehrle [the Vatican Librarian], as he is sure to be questioned on the subject. I am not likely to speak on the matter in the near future,¹ but I leave it you to make what use you like of this letter. Some people are sanguine, thinking I might get even behind the date of 1369. Although I do not deny the possibility, I cannot quite share their expectations. It is a real gain to have got so far.

I shall remain here for a considerable time yet, and in all

¹ I infer from this, though Father Zimmerman has never told me so, that his superiors in deposing him from the office of historiographer of the Order forbade him to write further upon the scapular and similar questions. This will, of course, explain why he has not published his discovery himself.

probability continue my researches elsewhere before I return to England.

The Feast of St. Aloysius at St. Ignazio's yesterday was very grand.

Believe me, dear Rev. Father,

Yours very sincerely,

FR. BENEDICT.

Now, I venture to say that here we have a letter which breathes in every line of it the spirit of a straightforward and candid searcher after historical truth. Personally, I thought at the time, and still think, that Father Zimmerman pushes the deductions which he draws from this piece of evidence, important as it undoubtedly is, rather too far. The text copied by Ballistarii clearly proves that in 1369 a scapular of smaller size was used by the Carmelite novices, and probably by the rest of the religious, to sleep in. Father Zimmerman would infer that because the would-be novice was to bring this small Scapular with him as part of his night outfit, it must have been a familiar object, already worn by persons not belonging to the Order. This does not seem to me to follow. A school may require, as many foreign schools do, or used to do, that intending pupils should bring a silver goblet with them for use in the refectory. It would not follow from this that silver goblets are commonly in use for children when they sit down to table in their own homes. Moreover, it is a commonplace among writers upon the social customs of the Middle Ages that down to the end of the fourteenth century, and even later, it was not usual for secular persons, either men or women, to wear any kind of dress in bed. The fact is attested to by countless miniatures and by other evidence. If, then, the *tunica* was something they were likely to wear for the first time, why not also the *parvum scapulare*? Such things as silver goblets are procured just to bring to school, and a postulant in the fourteenth century may have had a small scapular made just because it would be wanted in the noviceship to sleep in. None the less, I fully admit that this piece of evidence about a small scapular, which was in some way an imitation of that which formed part of the full religious habit, is

extremely important. Father Zimmerman is no doubt right in thinking that if Grossi, in 1426, or earlier, believed that Edward II. and other great personages 'scapulare Ordinis in vita clandestine portaverunt,' he had in view some such miniature garment as the Carmelite religious wore during the night. The curious thing is that Bale, who had been himself a Carmelite, should still speak of the necessity of dying in the *habit* of the Order. However, this small nocturnal scapular clearly marks an essential stage in the development of the two oblong strips of cloth joined with strings, which is what most lay persons without special acquaintance with the costume of religious understand by a scapular nowadays. To die in the Franciscan habit, or in that of one of the other mendicant Orders, was generally looked upon as a passport to Heaven; but the Carmelites, by introducing this miniature substitute for a habit, rendered it possible for men, while still continuing to discharge their duties in the world, to wear unobserved the livery of the Order of their choice.

In any case it is clear that even if Father Zimmerman's published articles left any room for doubt upon the subject, this confidential letter, written after he had been deposed from his office as historiographer, proves him to have been absolutely loyal in his championship of the Scapular as a Carmelite devotion. Is it possible, I ask, that the writer of such an epistle can have given any real occasion for the charge quoted in my last article—surely a very serious charge, as made by one Carmelite Father against another—that 'B. Z. makes relentless war on the Scapular'? Let us, at any rate, hope that now that Père Marie-Joseph has had his attention called to the truth he will make an honourable retraction of his former statement in terms that leave no room for ambiguity.

HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

THE BARNACLE ON DAYS OF FAST AND ABSTINENCE

APART from Lent and Advent, the weeks and seasons of the year are hallowed by abstinence or fasting, and hence we are often reminded of our obligations, and the sacrifices our religion entails. A somewhat similar spirit is to be found among the Christian sects, and although a fast is sometimes prescribed, its scope and outline do not seem very minutely defined.

The practice of fasting is not of to-day or yesterday. It was a recognized institution among the Jews, who proclaimed by a public crier their fasts. The heathens and idolators ascribed a virtue to fasting, and regarded it as among the works of religion, while the Mohammedans of to-day strictly observe the fast of the Arabian month Ramadan. Neither did the Messiah make any change in the Jewish custom and obligations. By word and example He perpetuated the law of fasting, and the Christian Church practised austerities in those early days that are to us at once a revelation and a reproof.

In enjoining upon us fasts or abstinence the Church bears in mind two considerations: one bears on the soul, and the other on the body; and while the soul or the spiritual life has ever been her first concern, the material or natural life and its healthy conditions have had always a due proportion of her maternal care.¹ The Apostle of the Gentiles says that there are within us two creatures: 'The first man is of the earth, earthly; the second man from heaven, heavenly. Therefore, as we have borne the image of the earthly, let us also bear the image of the heavenly.' We consist, then, of soul and body, and while the Church

¹ That fitting regard is entertained for our corporal health is abundantly evidenced by the prayer found in the Office and Mass of the Saturday before the first Sunday of Lent. Here we are taught to pray 'That this solemn fast, which is wholesomely instituted to cure our souls and bodies, may be devoutly observed by us.'

is mainly concerned with our higher existence, she has also a care for this lower and inferior part of our being. Thus fasting is enjoined within limitation, and in abstinence, while certain foods are withheld, sufficient substitutes are always found available. This leads us to consider a custom which, in places, seems to gather the force of a law, and it is the custom of using the barnacle on fast days as well as days of abstinence.

In all her dealings with us the Church is ever prudent, thoughtful, and sympathetic, and her every injunction full of meaning. When we duly reflect, her behests are not as a burden that is unbearable, but what must prove to be right-minded, in time, sweet and agreeable. St. Chrysostom has told us, in very few words, the aim the Church has in view in instituting fasts: 'Fast, because you have sinned: fast, so that you may not sin.' For the sinner, fasting is a potent and efficacious means of exciting contrition, and appeasing the divine justice. The prophets, who were commissioned by God to bring the people of Israel to repentance, always began by preaching penance. 'Be converted to Me with all your heart, in fasting and in weeping.' God has often withheld His avenging hand, when approached in a truly penitential spirit. The impious King Achab, who was a murderer and a persecutor of the prophets, at the warning of Elias, humbled himself, had recourse to fasting, and, covering himself with sackcloth, practised the most rigid mortification. The unhappy Ninivites—to whom the Prophet Jonas, the first entrusted with a message from God to the Gentile world, bore the unhappy tidings of the coming visitation, gave themselves over to penance, and their king proclaimed a fast, so that not even the beasts were allowed to eat or drink, and, coming down from his throne, clothed himself in sackcloth and sat in ashes. 'Who knows,' said he, 'but God may take compassion on us and pardon us.' He was not mistaken. God was moved to mercy, and spared the people of that vast Assyrian city. Without further investigating the precept and efficacy of fasting in the New Dispensation, I may only refer to the warning administered by the divine author of our faith to the men

of that time, which proves conclusively enough its obligation and effect : ' For as Jonas was a sign to the Ninivites ; so shall the Son of Man also be to this generation . . . The men of Ninive shall rise in judgment with this generation and shall condemn it, because they did penance at the preaching of Jonas ; and behold a greater than Jonas here.' Apart from the prolonged fast of forty days and forty nights in the desert, we have here the divine approval of Him who came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it.

While fasting is amongst the means most efficacious for making satisfaction to God for sins committed, it is correspondingly a remedy against falling into sin. The Apostle of the Gentiles was fully aware of this, as is clearly understood from his address to the Corinthians : ' But I chastise my body and bring it into subjection ; lest, perhaps, when I have preached to others, I myself should become a cast-away.' If a man's enemies are those of his own household, it may be right to infer that our bodies are our greatest hindrances in the spiritual path. The rules of society require us to restrain ourselves, to control our tongues, and have regard for the feelings of others, all of which entails considerable sacrifice : and if society exacts so much of its votaries, that they may find a recognized place, and escape the punishment of its censors, it is not too much to expect the laws of God require us to practise self-restraint and make self-sacrifice. In fasting we are reminded that in other respects we are to curb our passions, and that self-restraint which we exercise is another proof of our superiority to the animal world around us, and by inference of the immortality of the soul. If God in creating us intended us for a more perfect existence, He must have expected something of us, otherwise He would have immediately and directly called us forth into that greater bliss. The Breviary, in the lessons of Sexagesima Sunday, defines man as ' animal vivum, mortale, rationabile.' He differs from animate nature in that he is ' rationabile,' free to use his will, or to coerce it ; and, though it may at first seem something of a paradox, this freedom is manifested by the restraints which voluntary self-denial imposes.

It is the commonly recognized opinion of physicians that we generally use more food than is necessary, and it is felt that the supposed injury to health arising from the Church's discipline of fasting is not well founded on the unbiassed experience of centuries. Let it be observed that while the Church is stringent in reference to abstinence, the practice has ever been liberality with regard to fasting ; and if certain foods are prohibited, others equally substantial, if not so luxurious, are permitted, so that these substitutes create a regimen that proves physically very beneficial. We can therefore avail ourselves of whatever is necessary for the sustenance of the body, but it is recognized that the plainer the food, and the fewer the dishes, the greater is the immunity from disease, and the greater is the likelihood of a prolonged life. I may here quote the testimony of a Protestant author, who was a keen observer, and dealt with this subject in part from a purely human standpoint :—

It is only proper to observe, that as nothing is so prejudicial to health as hunger by constraint, so nothing is more beneficial to the constitution than voluntary abstinence. It is not without reason that religion enjoined this duty ; since it answered the double purpose of restoring the health oppressed by luxury, and diminished the consumption of provisions, so that a part might come to the poor. It should be the business of the legislature, therefore, to enforce this divine precept ; and thus, by restraining one part of mankind in the use of their superfluities, to consult for the benefit of those who want the necessaries of life. The injunctions of abstinence are strict over the whole Continent ; and were rigorously observed even among ourselves, for a long time after the Reformation. Queen Elizabeth, by giving her commands upon this head the air of a political injunction, lessened, in a great measure, and in my opinion very unwisely, the religious force of the obligation. She enjoined that her subjects should fast from flesh on Fridays and Saturdays ; but at the same time declared, that this was not commanded by motives of religion, as if there were any differences in meats, but merely to favour the consumption of fish, and thus to multiply the number of mariners ; and also to spare the stock of sheep, which might be more beneficial in another way. In this manner

the injunction defeated its own force ; and this most salutary law became no longer binding, when it was supposed to come purely from man. How far it may be enjoined in Scripture, I will not take upon me to say ; but this may be asserted, that if the utmost benefit to the individual, and the most extensive advantage to society, serve to mark any institution as of heaven, this of abstinence may be reckoned among the foremost.

What was the opinion of this writer of the eighteenth century is rather confirmed by the experience of the two subsequent ones, even with all their boasted advance ; and the wisdom of the Church is once more vindicated.

The ancients believed in abstemiousness, and Plutarch, de Valetudine, and others of that time, held that much animal food was detrimental to health. Though the Greeks and Romans were given over to the luxuries of the table, as appears from the writings of Athenæus and Horace, they admired abstemiousness, and their philosophers, and such as were regarded amongst them the virtuous and wise, made use of plain and simple diet. Pythagoras was a vegetarian, and the abstinence of the Pythagorean school was held in great esteem. Augustus, though emperor of the world, lived mostly on coarse family bread, cheese, figs, dates, grapes, and small fishes, and partook properly of but one meal a day, his refectation being so slight as not to deserve the name of a meal. The Emperor Aurelian fasted one full day every month, and we are assured that the taking of more than one full meal a day was considered in that age a monstrosity. It was an aphorism of Cicero, ' Non placet bis in die saturum fieri ' ; and Plato, on returning from Sicily, mentioned what was then a very extraordinary experience : he had seen a monster full fed twice a day, and the monster was no other than Dionysius the tyrant. The ancients, then, attributed benefits to fasting and abstemiousness, and claimed, as we do, their fruitfulness of health, and guarantee of prolonged life.

But they also, with us, attributed higher virtues to fasting, and included it in their religious observances. The priests of the idols prepared themselves by fasting before offering sacrifice, and Tertullian asserts the heathens dis-

posed themselves by a fast before they consulted the Oracles. The Athenian and Egyptian women fasted, and lay on the cold ground. Not only the ancient but the modern Jews ascribe virtues to fasting, and regard it as an act of religion. The Mohammedans of to-day observe an austere fast during the entire Arabian month Ramadan, which continues twenty-nine or thirty days, during which time they are not allowed food or drink from sunrise to sunset; and as the month sometimes falls in summer, when the heat in eastern countries is intense, the pain of thirst is very distressing. The use of the bath is not permitted, nor are they allowed to wash their faces. In the Church of England days of abstinence and fasting are appointed, including Lent, Ember days, Rogation days, and Fridays. No further directions are given, and it is difficult to learn what is the usual practice, and what are the obligations entailed. But apart from fast or abstinence, it is perfectly clear that the members of that faith, at certain times, are expected to forbear pleasures and amusements, and thus practise self-denial.

It cannot, then, be said that the Church is too exacting in her precept of fasting, for we have the experience of every age confirmatory of her wisdom, and she can point to the practices of so many different religions, if need be, in proof of her orthodoxy. In further proof of her wisdom, we have the remarkable longevity of the Fathers of the deserts, whose fasts and austerities excite our astonishment, and yet they always maintained a vigorous health, living to an age that we regard as almost fabulous; and we are quite sure that Hippocrates, the father of medicine, would applaud her Lenten regimen. I might have added the regimen of the early Church; for, as it happens, the observance of to-day by comparison hardly merits the name of fasting. In the primitive ages, on days of fast, the Christians used only herbs, pulse, roots, or fruit, with bread, but were also permitted to use a little fish. On the testimony of Clemens of Alexandria, they neither ate nor drank the least thing, until after sunset on fasting days, and were at all times abstemious.

The early Irish Church, we are assured on the authority of Camden, practised almost miraculous austerities. This was particularly so in the case of those consecrated to religion, and even the women and young girls fasted on Wednesdays and Saturdays, the whole year round. It is stated in the work *Cambrensis Eversus* that Ireland's apostle, St. Patrick, abstained from flesh meat during the whole course of his life, from the time he embraced the monastic profession,¹ and the custom was followed rigorously by most of the Irish saints. On the same authority we learn that St. Columba used not to take, during an entire week, as much food as a little beggar-boy would consume in one meal, and he never tasted wine, or any agreeable and delicate food : his ordinary drink was pure water, and his food was bread made of flour mixed with oats ; and it is related that when swine's flesh was served up to himself and his companions, he changed it into fish, lest he and they should be contaminated by the violation of their abstinence. The spirit that animated the religious also inspired the people, and their fasts were correspondingly rigid, so that even on certain solemn occasions the common animals were obliged to fast.

The Church is ever the same in spirit, but its practice may vary according to times or circumstances, and that its practice has changed amongst ourselves is undoubted. Are we justified in merely endeavouring to keep within the law? St. Jerome inveighs against those who merely observe the letter of the law:—

What advantage [he says] do you hope to receive by refraining from the use of oil, whilst, at the same, you seek scarce and delicate fruits: Carian dried figs, pepper, fruit of the palm tree (that is, nice dates), bread made of fine flour, Pistachio nuts? The garden is racked and ransacked to furnish dainties to the palate, which easily turn us out of the straight path to heaven. Plain, usual bread ought to content him who fasts.

¹ It is asserted that St. Patrick was a Canon Regular. In the Breviary of the Lateran Congregation there are second nocturn lessons for him, and a plenary indulgence may be gained on his feast in all the churches of the Order.

The practices against which St. Jerome inveighs, it may be feared, are not uncommon amongst ourselves, and although we may keep within the Church's precept, it may be well doubted if we gain the merit, which we could undoubtedly secure, by abstaining from studied delicacies.

In this connexion I may revert to a custom which was intended as the subject of this paper, but I confess the introduction has been somewhat elaborated: I mean the use of the barnacle on fast days and days of abstinence. Similarly the teal is used in America, and the folaga, or *Gallinella aquatica*, sometimes, in Rome. As to the barnacle, my reference is to the bird that frequents the Irish shores in the winter months, notably the coast of Kerry in the South, and Derry in the North.¹ This is the fabled bird, with others of the same species, supposed to have originated from the barnacle, and to be evolved from that crustacean. The idea still prevails among the inhabitants of the Derry coast, where the bird is found, and it is understood the same impression exists elsewhere in Ireland. This is important, as bearing on the custom which regards the barnacle goose as fish. Until comparatively recent times the same impression existed even among naturalists of acknowledged repute. Thus we find the ancient herbalist, Gerrard, who wrote in the sixteenth century, referring to

a certaine spume or froth, that in time breedeth into certaine shels, in shape like those of the muskle, but sharper pointed—and when it is perfectly formed, the shell gapeth open, till all length it is all come forth [i.e., the bird], and hangeth only by the bill: in a short space after it commeth to full maturitie, and falleth into the sea, where it gathereth feathers, and groweth to a fowl bigger than a mallard, but lesser than a goose, having black legs and bill, or beake, and feathers blacke and white spotted, in such a manner as our mag-pie, called in some places a pie-annet, which the people of Lancashire call by no other name than a tree goose.

¹ The scoter is *Anas nigra*, and not the same as the gannet. The gannet is the same as the solan goose. The barnacle is quite another bird, neither gannet, scoter, nor solan goose.—Professor Dakin, University of Liverpool.

Du Bartas gives the same idea in these lines quoted by Piscator, in Walton's *Complete Angler*, which was published in 1653 :—

So slow Boötes underneath him sees,
In the icy islands, goslings hatch'd of trees,
Whose fruitful leaves, falling into the water,
Are turned, 'tis known, to living fowls soon after.

So rotten planks of broken ships do change,
To barnacles. O transformation strange !
'Twas first a green tree, then a broken hull,
Lately a mushroom, now a flying gull.

A similar allusion as to the embryology of birds of this species is found in the somewhat familiar lines of the poet Hudibras :—

As barnacles turn soland geese
In the islands of the Orcades.

The French naturalist, Bénache, writing in the *Nouv. Dictionnaire de Histoire Naturelle*, makes a reference which bears upon our subject : ' C'est un gibier d'eau fort estimé : une qualité que les pieux gourmets savent apprecier, c'est qu'on peut les manger dans le temps d'abstinence religieuse.' Although in this quotation there is no reference to the origin of the bird in question, it is clear that a custom akin to ours is not unknown in France.

In Lynch's *Cambrensis Eversus*, from the charge of Giraldus, and his description of the barnacle, we learn what was the prevailing belief in those days of the origin of the bird : ' In some parts of Ireland,' he says, ' those birds, which are called barnacles, are eaten without scruple by the bishops and ecclesiastics, on the ground that the birds are not flesh, as they are not born of flesh ' He then gives an account of the mode in which these birds are produced :—

Barnacles are produced by nature in a wonderful way, and against nature : they are like wild geese, but of smaller size. At first they spring out like gum or pine wood floating on the sea. Then, to develop their forms with more ease, they hang in shells by their beaks, like sea-weed clinging to wood, and having, in

due time, acquired a firm clothing of feathers, they either drop into the sea, or wing their way to the open fields of air, having by a secret and wonderful mode of generation received both their food and growth from the humours of the timber and sea-water. I often saw with my own eyes more than a thousand small animals of this kind, shut up in their shells, perfectly formed and hanging from one plank of timber. Eggs are not produced by these in the ordinary way by coition. Nor does any bird ever mature them by incubation: in no corner of the land are they known either to build nests or to copulate.

The author goes on to say:—

Birds of this kind are known in our days to cling by their beaks, not only to the fir-tree, but also to the pine. Swarms of them may be seen hanging from the keels of the vessels drawn up on shore, after long voyages. Locked up in their shells, they draw their food with their beaks from the wood which is becoming rotten by the long action of the water, and on this nourishment they gradually grow, the shell always expanding in proportion with the increase of bulk, until at length they abandon both the shells and the pine, and begin first to swim in the sea, and then to fly. When full grown they are not unlike wild ducks, but larger; they are smaller than geese. The Irish call them Durrudin, the Scots, Clates and Soland geese; for these birds are found in Scotland as well as in Ireland. In the narrative which he has left us of his legatine mission in Scotland in 1448, Æneas Sylvius, afterwards Pope Pius II., states that he had heard long ago 'there was a tree¹ in Scotland, which, if planted on the bank of a river, produced fruit having the shape of ducks, and that when they were nearly ripe they fell of their own accord, some into the water, others on the ground; but those which fell on the ground, rotted, while those which were plunged into the water, immediately became alive, and swam under the water, or rose in the air fully winged and feathered. Having heard of the matter we made enquiries about it, and learned that the miracles were retreating farther away from us, and that this famous tree was not found in Scotland but in the Orkneys.' Camden states that birds of this kind are produced from the old and rotten planks of

¹ In the *Cosmographia Universalis* of Munster is found a representation of the barnacle goose tree, showing the barnacles on the branches and the liberated geese in the water beneath.—F. Martin Duncan, British Naturalist.

ships, as everyone knows who saw the ship in which Francis Drake circumnavigated the globe drawn up on a bank of the Thames. Great numbers of these little birds, but dead and featherless, were found clinging to the outside of the keel. Such birds are certainly found hanging from the keels of vessels returning to the shores of France after a long voyage.

I have quoted at some length to show what was the common opinion in the time of Giraldus, as well as Gratianus Lucius. I may observe, however, there is a later theory, which seems something of a compromise. It is :—

The barnacle comes from Norway,¹ and is hatched from eggs, which the bird deposits in a large plant or tree, which is known as the barnacle tree, and grows over small inlets of the sea. This tree has a blossom, or leaf, something like a large water-lily, and the eggs are dropped in the opening or petal, and by some natural means hatched. The young birds draw their sustenance from the water, through this stem, and as they gradually become heavier the flower-leaf bends and they finally drop into the water.

I cannot, however, quote any authority that is reliable for the statement, although it does not appear to clash with modern scientific investigation.

We have thus heard the different views propounded, at different times, of the evolution of the barnacle.² But all these must cede, when confronted with the research and incontrovertible conclusions of modern naturalists. Nearly two centuries ago the author of *Animated Nature* held that this bird was produced as any other, and this same is the universal verdict of the ornithologists and naturalists of

¹ 'I think the story is given in the *Cosmographia Universalis* of Munster. As a matter of fact, it is now thoroughly known that these birds do, and have always propagated their species, in the same way as all other birds, building their nests and rearing their young from the eggs deposited by the female bird.'—F. Martin Duncan, *British Naturalist*.

² 'Max Muller (*Science of Language*, 2nd series, p. 534) gives references to a number of old authors who vouch for the truth of this legend, going back as far as Giraldus Cambrensis in the twelfth century. The legend appears to be of Scotch or Irish origin. Giraldus complains of the clergy in Ireland eating barnacle geese at the time of fasting, under the pretext that they are not flesh, but born of fish living in the sea. The form of the legend varies, certain authors alleging that the geese are pro-

to-day.¹ But what of the custom founded upon this erroneous impression? Personally, I do not wish to deal with the matter from a theological standpoint. I shall only quote the opinion of the author of *Cambrensis Eversus*: 'Such is the authority of custom, that it can validly antiquate human laws; and though the first authors of any improper custom sin by introducing it, yet, when it has been confirmed by long usage, people are not guilty of any sin in embracing it in after times.' Besides birds that frequent and live mostly on water, feeding for the greater part on fish, if not fish may be said to partake somewhat of the nature of fish. And let me here quote the definition of the same author: 'Under the term flesh-meat is to be included the flesh of those animals which, by their nature, can live a long time out of water. But those are called fishes which cannot live by nature a long time out of water.' At Magilligan, Derry, these birds hover mostly on the water, flying in flocks, while their calls can be heard for miles. They are usually shot while feeding on the mud banks, from punts which the sportsmen manage to steer within their range.

Even so, I do not think we have yet established that the barnacle partakes of the nature of fish in any sufficient degree to warrant the custom of its use. But a custom, somewhat akin to ours, is found in America, where the teal-duck is used on fast days, and the grounds upon which the practice prevails are not a whit more conclusive than our own. An Irish priest who had travelled extensively in the United States assured me that he partook of the teal

duced from the fruits of a tree, which drop into the water, others that they grow in shells (barnacles) attached to floating logs. Aldrovandus (*De Avibus*, t. iii., 1603, p. 174) ingeniously combines both versions in a woodcut, representing undoubted barnacles growing on a tree with luxuriant foliage at the water's edge, below which a number of liberated geese are swimming.'—*Cambridge Natural History*, 1909.

¹ 'The barnacle goose was supposed by early naturalists to arise from the ships' barnacle. The legs of the crustacean, allied as it is to the crab group, stick out from under the shell, resembling somewhat a bird's tail feathers. This was quite enough for the ancient naturalists, who immediately constructed the fable of the development of the bird, which they saw in the district, from the barnacle shell.'—W. J. Dakin, University of Liverpool.

with the priests at Salt Lake City on fast days ; and a well-known American ecclesiastic and author asserts that such is the custom in the Archdiocese of New Orleans. On consulting a distinguished ecclesiastic at Rome, on the reputed custom of using the water-hen on occasions of fasts in that city, I received the reply :—

As far as I can ascertain the usage to which you refer is unknown in Rome. The *minimi*¹ of S. Francesco di Paula are celebrated, however, for lenten fare, since they are never allowed the use of meat, if I do not err. It seems that in the time of Pius VII. they obtained a Decree (1804) allowing them to regard the folaga, or *Gallinella aquatica*—which corresponds to the water-hen²—as not coming within the definition of flesh-meats.

I have already shown that the use of such birds on fast days is not unknown in France, and if I were permitted again to quote the work *Cambrensis Eversus*, I might show that the Benedictines of those days regarded cormorants and moor-hens as among fishes, and that the Cistercians, who never used flesh-meat even to save their lives, made no scruple to eat barnacles.

I will be told, however, that no one now accepts the original theory of the origin of the barnacle, and that my article, if it served any purpose, will have the effect of bringing to a finish a good old custom that so long prevailed. I must respectfully demur to this statement, and from experience, which is not inconsiderable, I am convinced this theory is not entirely of the past. I have heard those in high social positions and educated, propounding the statement that they had seen the barnacle evolving from the shell, gathering feathers, and ready to drop into the sea. I am quite sure the naturalists of to-day will gladly enter into the merits of the case, and richly reward the demonstrator of this singular phenomenon.

¹ The Minims were founded by St. Francis of Paula in 1436, and were so called, because they wished to be regarded as the least of the monastic Orders. The members observed a perpetual Lent, and never touched meat, fish, eggs, or milk.

² It is asserted there is a close similarity in formation and flavour between the water-hen and barnacle.

Neither do I think that any statement I have made is likely to even remotely affect the custom. All the likelihood is in the contrary direction. We could conceive the possibility of the Church outlining and minutely defining what might be regarded as fish. But it is not my province to enter into that phase of the question. My object was to deal with the custom as existing in Ireland, at least in some dioceses, and refer to the supposed origin of that custom; meanwhile keeping before me facts as confronted with modern science. And even though the former theory on the generation of the barnacle is erroneous or fabulous, being aquatic it could be used, and on the same principle, as the teal or *Gallinella*. Truth is great and shall prevail.

D. F. M'CREA. h

THE MOZARABIC MASS

VISITORS to the Eucharistic Congress in Madrid will have an opportunity of assisting at a Mozarabic Mass, and I venture to predict that not a few of those who take advantage of the opportunity will retain recollections of the Mass fresh in their memories when they will have forgotten other scenes and other sights of sunny Spain. Recently I had the good fortune to be present at a Mass said according to this venerable rite, and I may state, with truth, that the ceremonies have left an impression on my mind which time cannot obliterate.

In Toledo, which is within easy reach of Madrid, the Mozarabic Mass and Office are said daily in a chapel founded for the purpose by the great Cardinal Ximenes. One other city in Spain—Salamanca—shares with Toledo the glorious privilege of keeping the liturgy alive and handing it on to posterity. In the latter city, however, the Office is not said and the Mass is celebrated only at rare intervals during the year—generally about Easter and Pentecost.

The Mozarabic liturgy may be treated under various aspects, viz., its origin, antiquity, history, its agreement with the Gallican, and divergence from the Roman, liturgy and, finally, its peculiar ceremonies in the administration of the Sacraments and the celebration of Mass. To deal with all these points at any adequate length is not possible within the limits of this article, so I will confine myself principally to the Mass. I do so in the hope that I may enable readers coming to Spain to follow the ceremonies with intelligent interest.

It is not necessary for me to describe the vestments, as they are similar in all respects to those used in the celebration of Mass according to the Roman rite. For a like reason the altar and its ornaments do not call for special remark. A glance, however, through the pages of the Missal will repay the trouble. Perhaps I had better sa

Missals, for two are placed on the altar—one on the Gospel, the other on the Epistle, side—and during the whole Mass the celebrant constantly turns from one to the other. The title of one is 'Omnium Offerentium,' so called because it contains the fixed prayers generally said by all priests celebrating according to the Mozarabic rite. The other is called 'Missale Mixtum secundum regulam Beati Isidori, dictum Muzarabes': it contains the prayers and other parts of the Mass that vary with the feasts. Before explaining the title I wish to say a few words about the part played by Cardinal Ximenes in connexion with Mozarabic liturgy.

In his day it was gradually sinking into oblivion; the Missal and Breviary, written in ancient Gothic characters, were difficult to read, and Mass, as a consequence, was said but rarely. The Roman liturgy was gradually supplanting it on all sides. The great Cardinal clearly realized what a loss it would mean to the Church if such a valuable depository to doctrine and practices were suffered to perish. To save the liturgy he had the MSS. collected, entrusted them to competent hands for collation and publication, with the result that a Missal appeared in 1500 printed in black letter. The Breviary followed in 1502. In addition to the building of the chapel already referred to, he made provision for the maintenance of thirteen chaplains. In this way he secured the perpetuity of the rite.

The celebrated Father Alexander Leslie, S.J., had the Missal reprinted in 1756. The opening pages contain a scholarly preface from his pen, in which he treats of the Mozarabic liturgy under all its aspects; and his treatment is so erudite and exhaustive that a learned Spaniard gives him credit for having said the last word on the subject. Besides the preface the Missal has an appendix containing some 125 pages of most interesting and useful notes. Incidentally, I may mention that practically all my information has been gathered from these two sources.

Now I return to the question of the title. Various explanations have been given for it. I will state the more probable.

It is called 'Missale Mixtum,' not, as some have held,

because of innovations introduced out of harmony with the Gotho-Spanish liturgy, but because in addition to being a simple Missal it contains hymns, antiphons, responsoria, and also formulas for the blessing of bread and holy water. 'Secundum regulam Beati Isidore': not a few have maintained that St. Isidore was the author both of the liturgy and the Missal, but the weight of arguments goes to show that both one and the other were in existence long before his day. His name, however, is connected with the subject because in his book *De Officiis Ecclesiasticis* he explained the character of the liturgy, and made some emendations and modifications. 'Dictum Muzarabes': this is an echo of the Moorish domination in Spain. Strange it is that a rite so closely related to the Sacrifice of the Cross should be inseparably connected, at least in name, with the followers of the Crescent. At various times the liturgy has been called Gotho-Spanish, Isidorian, but the name by which it is now known, and probably will be known to the end of time, is Mozarabic. The origin of the name is explained thus: The Spanish Christians, who lived under the sway of the Arab Muza and his successors, got the name Muzarabes, and as they continued to use the old liturgy after the Roman had been adopted in other parts of Spain, the name Muzarabes was also applied to it.

The Missal is divided into two parts. The first part includes the 'Proprium de Tempore' and the proper Masses of a few saints preceding and following the Feast of the Nativity of our Lord. The second part contains the 'Sanctorale' or Proper of Saints, the 'Commune,' Votive Masses, and finally 'Missae pro Defunctis.'

The Mozarabic Missal agrees with Gallican in that it begins with the first Sunday of Advent, but differs from the old Roman, which began with the Feast of the Nativity of our Lord or with the Kalends of January. Formerly the Spanish Advent had six Sundays, to each of which a proper Mass is assigned. The Feast of the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin is one of those celebrated immediately before the Nativity. To the Nativity itself only one Mass is assigned. In this, too, the Missal is in harmony with the

Gallican, but differs from the Roman, which contained three proper Masses of the feast. It may be of interest to note that there is no Mass of the Vigil of the Nativity. In former times Spaniards were forbidden to fast or observe vigils in Advent owing to the heresy of the Priscillianists.¹ These latter denied the mystery of the Incarnation, and were accustomed to fast and practise other austerities during Advent; so by way of protest the orthodox Spaniards did not fast.

Following the Nativity comes the Feast of the Circumcision, and after it that of the Epiphany, which in early times terminated the Spanish Advent. From Epiphany to Quadragesima there are nine Dominical Masses, the title of the last being 'Dominica ante diem Cineris.' There is no mention of Septuagesima, Sexagesima or Quinquagesima. From Quadragesima to Easter there are twenty-one Masses: six Dominical, the rest ferial. *Feria quarta* and *Feria sexta* of each week in Lent have proper Masses, and the last week has in addition special Masses for Holy Thursday and Saturday. It would appear that in former times the Spaniards were not accustomed to say Mass during Lent on days other than those mentioned.² All the days of Easter week have Masses assigned to them. From the Octave of Easter Sunday to Pentecost seven Masses are found in the Missal: four Dominical followed by the Feast of the Ascension, then 'Dominica post Ascensionem,' and finally the Vigil of Pentecost. From Pentecost to the end of the liturgical year there are eight Dominical Masses, the title of the last being 'Dominica ante jejuniū Kalendarum Novembriū.' The Feasts of Corpus Christi and of the Holy Trinity have been inserted in recent times. The 'Proprium de Tempore' ends with the Mass called 'In jejuniū Kalendarum Novembriū.'

As I have already stated the second part begins with the 'Sanctorale.' As the number of saints having proper Masses is very limited, an enumeration of some of them may not be altogether devoid of interest. There are four

¹ Father Leslie, Preface.

² Father Leslie, Notes.

Masses of the Blessed Virgin, two of St. John the Baptist, and five of the Apostles in the following order: one of SS. Peter and Paul; one of SS. Simon and Jude; finally, Saints Matthias, Bartholomew and Matthew have one each. The day on which the Feast of St. James, the patron of Spain, was celebrated by the Gotho-Spaniards is not known, so his Mass is found not in the 'Sanctorale,' but in a different part of the Missal. Of the saints of Gaul only three have proper Masses, one being St. Martin of Tours. The Church of Rome is represented by Saints Sebastian, Laurence, Cosmas and Damian, Agnes, Cecilia and Eugenia; the Church of Africa by Saints Cyprian, Speratus and Marciana; Palestine by St. Mary Magdalen; Antioch by SS. Babilus and Romanus; Cappadocia by St. Dorothea; Spain itself by twenty-two martyrs. Apparently up to the time of St. Martin of Tours the feasts of saints who were not martyrs were not celebrated. St. Mary Magdalen was regarded as a martyr by the Gotho-Spaniards.

After the 'Sanctorale' comes the Common of Martyrs, Confessors and Virgins. In all there are ten such Masses: six of martyrs, two of confessors, and two of virgins.

Glancing over the list of names appended to the end of the Missal I was equally surprised and delighted to find that Ireland's saints were not altogether omitted. There I saw the names St. Patrick, St. Brigid and St. Columbanus, Abbot. The early Irish missionaries penetrated as far as Seville; so it is not unlikely that the Spaniards of old heard much about the fame of the 'Island of Saints and Scholars.' Montalembert apparently asserts that a church was built in Seville in honour of St. Brigid.¹ Here I may also mention that Father Leslie in his preface and notes refers frequently to the Bobbio Missal, which is ascribed to St. Columbanus.

Eight Votive Masses follow the Common of Saints. Then come the Masses for the dead, six in number. They include Masses for deceased bishops, priests, deacons and subdeacons, 'Pro uno defuncto,' 'Pro pluribus defunctis,' for All Souls' Day; and, finally, 'Missa parvulorum'

¹ *Monks of the West*, vol. i. p. 547.

defunctorum,' said for baptized children who died before coming to the use of reason. In looking over these Masses I was not a little surprised by the frequent occurrence of *alleluias*. However, I find that this is not peculiar to the Gotho-Spanish liturgy. The offices for the dead in the Gallican and old Roman liturgies¹ also contained *alleluias*. The practice derived its origin probably from the admonition of St. Paul to the Thessalonians² where he exhorted them not to grieve on account of their departed friends.

In the enumeration which I have given of the contents of the Missal I have purposely refrained from making comparisons with the Roman, and for two reasons: first, because such comparisons would take up too much space. Secondly, because it was unnecessary to make them, as the readers may easily see for themselves in what the Missals agree and in what they differ.

I will now proceed to speak of the Mass itself. Like the Missal it is divided into two parts. The first part, from the beginning to the Offertory, was in former times the Mass of the catechumens; from the Offertory to the end the Mass of the faithful. At first it was my intention to treat of the prayers and ceremonies separately, but on reflection I deem it better to deal with them conjointly. By so doing unnecessary repetition will be avoided and possible confusion prevented. However, whilst accompanying the celebrant through the Mass, I will take the liberty of interrupting its course, where I think it necessary, to call attention to prayers or other points requiring explanation. I will also avail myself of the moments when he is making his preparation to offer a few general remarks.

The reader will remember what I have said about the two Missals. Perhaps nothing in the Mass arrests the attention of one present for the first time so much as the constant turning of the celebrant from side to side. The word 'Oremus' occurs but twice, once at the beginning of the 'Missa fidelium,' and again before the 'Pater Noster.' The reason for this is to be sought for in the discipline of

¹ Father Leslie, Notes.

² Thess. iv. 2.

the early Church. In those days it was the duty of the deacon to admonish the people when they were to raise their voices in prayer. The responses of the server are very numerous, and continue through the whole Mass.

Once only, as well as I can remember, did the celebrant face the congregation, viz., when imparting the last blessing. In former times the priests said Mass turned towards the faithful, as is the custom in some churches in Rome at the present day, so there was no necessity to change their position when saluting the people. In this connexion I may mention that the salutation is always 'Dominus sit semper vobiscum.' This and the doxology 'Gloria et honor Patri et Filio . . .' are given as indications of the antiquity of the liturgy.

One other and last remark. There are several differences between High and Low Masses, between those for the living and those for the dead; however, the plan or outline of all—if I may use the expression—is much alike; so a description of the ceremonies of the Mass at which I assisted will give the readers a fair idea of the general characteristics of a Mozarabic Mass.

Immediately before vesting the celebrant kneels and recites four 'Ave Marias.' He then rises, signs himself and each of the vestments with the sign of the Cross. The prayers said during the vesting agree in substance with the corresponding prayer in the Roman Missal, but not one of them agrees *verbatim*. When fully vested the celebrant makes an humble confession of his unworthiness to offer up the Sacrifice of the Immaculate Lamb, after which he proceeds with hands joined to the altar. Arrived there and standing *in plano* he says (*alta voce*) either a prayer beginning with the words 'Per gloriam nominis tui Christe,' or an 'Ave Maria.' The psalm 'Judica,' the 'Confiteor' and 'Aufer a nobis,' which follows, have been introduced by the Mozarabes.

Having kissed the altar the celebrant salutes the cross with a prayer, which commences as follows, 'Salve crux pretiosa.' Two more short prayers, which do not call for special notice, are then said. Meanwhile the chalice is

carried to the altar. The celebrant taking the corporal spreads it in its proper place, and, while doing so, recites a prayer which in former times was said by the deacon after the Offertory. After the chalice has been wiped, wine and water are poured in, and the prayers which accompany the action are very appropriate, as they contain references to the blood and water that flowed from the side of Christ. I should have mentioned that the Host is not taken to the altar with the chalice, but is afterwards received by the celebrant from the hand of the server. This ceremony is probably a relic of early times, when the faithful were accustomed to present the bread and wine for the Holy Sacrifice. Blessing the Host the celebrant places it on the paten. In passing, I may add that the Host is never deposited on the corporal, but always rests on the paten when not actually in the hands of the celebrant. Perhaps it is well also to mention that the Offertory does not take place till the Gospel has been said.

Some versicles and responses come next, and after them the 'Gloria in Excelsis.' More versicles precede the reading of the lessons from Scripture. In connexion with the latter it is interesting to note that in addition to the Epistle and Gospel another lesson called a prophecy is always read. From Easter to Pentecost this lesson is taken from the Apocalypse, according to a decree of the Fourth Council of Toledo held in 633, but during the rest of the year it is taken from the Old Testament.

Before reading the Epistle the celebrant, standing in the middle of the altar, says (*alta voce*) 'Silentium facite.' Similarly before the Gospel he says, in the same tone, 'Evangelium.' The Offertory succeeds. The prayers said during the Offertory are similar to but not identical with the corresponding prayers in the Roman Missal.

At the washing of the fingers only three verses of the psalm 'Lavabo' are said.

The 'Missa fidelium' is now about to commence. With hands joined before his breast and profoundly bowed towards the altar the celebrant once more makes a sorrowful confession of his faults. Then comes the salutation 'Dominus

sit semper vobiscum,' after which the celebrant proceeds to read the prayer called 'Missa.' Here I will take leave of him for a moment for the purpose of making a few preliminary remarks about the number and arrangement of the prayers that follow.

As I have already mentioned, St. Isidore explained the character of the Gotho-Spanish liturgy. His remarks about the Mass will be to the point here. According to him the characteristic feature of the 'Missa fidelium' was that it contained seven fixed 'Orationes.' I will give them order and titles just as I find them in the Missal which I have before me: (1) 'Missa'; (2) 'Alia Oratio'; (3) 'Post Nomina'; (4) 'Ad Pacem'; (5) 'Illatio,' corresponding to the preface in the Roman Missal; (6) 'Post Pridie,' and (7) 'Oratio Dominica.' The two latter follow the Consecration, the rest precede it. The Mozarabic Mass has no Canon properly so called, for though the names are fixed the prayers vary from day to day according to the feasts. The 'Oratio Dominica' is of course invariable. Having made these observations I return to the celebrant. Standing in the middle of the altar, and placing his left hand on the Missal and his right on the 'Omnium Offerentium,' he reads the prayer 'Missa.' The Orationes which follow are recited with hands extended. The prayer 'Post Nomina' is so called because in the early ages of the Church it followed the reading of the diptychs by the deacon. These contained the names of the saints to be commemorated and also the names of the living and dead who were to participate in the fruits of the Mass. The Memento 'Pro vivis et pro mortuis,' which is always made at this part of the Mass, is a vestige of the ancient practice. Further on I shall have occasion to refer to other mementos that have been introduced in later times.

Having recited the 'Oratio ad Pacem' the celebrant gives the pax to the deacon, or server, saying 'Habete osculum dilectionis et pacis ut apti sitis sacrosanctis mysteriis Dei.' These words explain themselves. The 'Illatio' is preceded by some versicles, with their responses, and terminates with the 'Sanctus.' The 'Post Sanctus,' or ampli-

fication of the 'Sanctus,' appropriately leads on to the narratory preamble of the Consecration. At the present time the forms for the Consecration of both species are the same as those in the Roman Missal, but it is interesting to note that the Gotho-Spanish liturgy had peculiar forms. They are still retained in the Missal so I give them :—

Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur.

Quotiescumque manducaveritis. . . .

Similiter et calicem postquam cenavit dicens.

Hic ✠ est calix novi testamenti in meo sanguine, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.

Between the words 'Hic' and 'est' the sign of the cross was made over the chalice. I may add that the form for the Consecration of the Chalice, as given above, is found verbatim in the *Vetus Itala*, but not in the *Vulgate*. Since the time of Berengarius, the practice of elevating the Host and chalice, immediately after their consecration, has been introduced. I noticed however, that the chalice was covered with the pall.

The 'Oratio Post Pridie,' which follows, has at times engaged the serious attention of students of dogma. It is said in all Masses, and, in some instances, at least closely resembles the Epiclesis or Invocation of the Holy Ghost found in Oriental liturgies. St. Isidore defined it as the 'Confirmatio Sacramenti, ut oblatio, quae Domino offertur, per spiritum sanctum sanctificata, Christi corporis et sanguinis confirmetur.' Some writers of note have maintained that the 'Post Pridie' is to the Mozarabic Mass what the Epiclesis is to the Greek. However, in reality there are many differences. In the Greek liturgy the form of invocation is fixed and always addressed to the Holy Ghost, whereas the 'Orationes Post Pridie' vary from day to day. At one time they are addressed to the Father, at another to the Son, and again to the Holy Spirit.

That the Gotho-Spaniards never had any doubt about the efficacy of the words of Consecration is evident from the prayers themselves. In some 'Orationes Post Pridie' God is invoked to bless and sanctify what is already admitted

to be the Body and Blood of Christ. For example: 'Hoc sacrificium respicere et sanctificare digneris *quod est verum Corpus et Sanguis Filii tui.*' In others there is absolutely no invocation of any kind nor any request to bless or sanctify the elements. This is, I consider, a convincing proof of the orthodoxy of the Gotho-Spaniards, for if they had any doubt about the efficacy of the words of Consecration every 'Oratio Post Pridie' should contain an invocation. However, that the readers may judge for themselves I will copy *verbatim* two prayers from the Missal, one with an invocation, the other without it:—

I.

Fratres commemorationem passionis, mortis et Resurrectionis Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Filii tui precamur Omnipotens Pater. Ut has hostias Sancto altario superpositas intendas propicius, sanctifices et benedicas ac sumentibus ad salutem pertinere concedas.

R. Amen.¹

II.

Sanctifica Domine ministerium, exilara ministrantem, illustra templum, orna altarium; ordina populum; cura morbum, dona remedium; proba votum ut omnes de diabolica astucia liberati, non insidiantem timeant sed curantem.


R. Amen.

Almost immediately after the 'Post Pridie' the Host is once more elevated for the adoration of the faithful. The celebrant, holding It over the uncovered chalice, says (*alta voce*), 'Ad confractionem panis'; then, in the same tone, 'Fidem quam corde credimus ore dicamus.' The Constantinopolitan Creed follows. It is recited alternately by the celebrant and the server, after this manner: 'C. Credimus in unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem.' 'S. Factorem coeli et terrae, visibilium omnium et invisibilium conditorem.' And so on to the end. It may be of interest to state that the following words occur in it: 'Natum non factum, omousion Patri, hoc est ejusdem cum Patre, substantiae.'

During the whole recital the celebrant holds the Host with

¹The translation here is difficult to render, yet the wording is correct.

one hand over the chalice. The division of the Host which then takes place is perhaps the most interesting ceremony of the whole Mass. It is broken into nine parts, each of which represents a mystery of our Lord's life ; so the action follows most appropriately the profession of faith. As each part is deposited on the paten the name of the mystery which it represents is pronounced. The order is as follows : (1) Corporatio=Incarnatio ; (2) Nativitas ; (3) Circumcisio ; (4) Apparatio=Epiphania ; (5) Passio ; (6) Mors ; (7) Resurrectio ; (8) Gloria ; and (9) Regnum. The particles are placed on the paten in the form of a cross. The following diagram, which is copied from the Missal, will give the readers a clearer concept of the arrangement than any words of mine could :—



For convenience' sake I will call the particles by the names of the mysteries represented when I shall have occasion to make further references to them.

Having made a memento 'pro vivis,' the celebrant says 'Oremus,' and proceeds to read a short 'capitulum' that precedes the 'Oratio Dominica.' The prayer itself is divided into seven petitions, to five of which the server responds

'Amen.' Thus: 'C. Pater noster qui es in coelis.' 'R. Amen.' To the petition 'Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie,' the response is not 'Amen,' but 'Quia Deus es.' The last response is 'Sed libera nos a malo.'

After the Embolism or development of the Lord's Prayer comes what is called the 'Conjuncta corporis et sanguinis Domini.' Taking the particle 'Regnum,' the celebrant holds It over the chalice, and says, during Paschal time, 'Vicit Leo de Tribu Juda Radix David Alleluia.' This and the response, 'Qui sedes super cherubim Radix David Alleluia,' are repeated three times. The particle is then allowed to drop into the chalice.

The moment of Communion is now at hand. An appropriate invitation to the faithful, to approach the sacred banquet begins as follows: 'Gustate et videte quam suavis est Dominus Alleluia.' After reciting it the celebrant takes the particle 'Gloria,' and holding It in both hands over the chalice he makes a memento, 'pro mortuis.' The particles are then consumed one by one, and in the inverse order to that in which they had been placed on the paten. Thus the particle 'Gloria' is the first, and 'Corporatio' the last.

The prayers which precede and follow the consumption of the chalice do not call for any special notice.

The usual formula for dismissing the people is 'Missa, acta est, in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi perficiamus cum pace.' 'R. Deo gratias.' In the early ages of the Church the Mass ended here, but in more recent times some additions have been introduced. After pronouncing the formulas for dismissal the celebrant descends to the foot of the altar and kneeling on the lowest step says 'Salve Regina.' Then rising he ascends the altar, kisses it, saying, 'In unitate Sancti Spiritus,' and, turning towards the people, blesses them, with the words 'Benedicat Vos Pater ✠ et Filius,' after which he immediately descends the altar, and retires to the sacristy.

Here I conclude, though I feel but too well that my treatment of the subject has been very incomplete and superficial. I have omitted many interesting details, and dismissed with a few words matters about which pages

might be written. I may mention that I had to write the article rather hurriedly in order that it might be in the hands of the public before the Congress. At some future date I may, with the kind permission of the Editor, deal, in the pages of the I. E. RECORD, with other aspects of the Mozarabic liturgy—a liturgy that is perhaps as old as the Catholic Church in Spain.

P. J. BRADLEY.

Notes and Queries

CANON LAW

THE TEMPORAL ADMINISTRATION OF CLERICS

REV. DEAR SIR,—A Decree has been issued recently, I believe, concerning 'The Temporal Administration of Clerics.' For information's sake, might I ask what is the sum and substance of this Decree, what are the obligations it imposes, and whether the Decree in question binds *sub gravi*?

LUX IN TENEBRIS.

Our correspondent evidently refers to the now rather famous Decree published in the official Roman bulletin of November 20, 1910. We need not give the full text. It has been already given in the I. E. RECORD.¹

The document opens with a reference to St. Paul's teaching that 'no man being a soldier to God entangleth himself with secular business,' recalls the constant law and discipline of the Church prohibiting clerics from undertaking profane pursuits, and quotes the well-known regulation of Trent² confirming the 'manysalutary' prescriptions already enforced on the subject. In our times, it goes on to say, there are many institutions—among them principally money banks, rural banks, and savings banks—established for the temporal good of the faithful. To all these the clergy are to give approval and encouragement, but are not to allow themselves to be drawn aside thereby from the duties of their state or involved in the cares, dangers, and responsibilities that the management of such institutions always entails. The Holy Father, therefore, while he exhorts and commands clerics to give aid and advice in establishing, guiding, and furthering these undertakings, forbids them to assume, without the special permission of the Apostolic See, or to retain beyond a period of four months from the date of the Decree, such positions in con-

¹ February, 1911, p. 216.

² Sess. xxii. c. i., *De Ref.*

nexion with these institutions as entail the cares, obligations, and dangers of administration—the positions, that is, of president, manager, secretary, treasurer, and the like. The obligation imposed is obviously grave *ex genere suo*.

Among the ‘many salutary regulations’ spoken of by Trent the most general is found in the third book of the Decretals: ‘Ne clerici vel monachi secularibus negotiis se immisceant.’¹ In fact it includes all the others. The special prohibitions against a cleric’s engaging in commercial pursuits or acting as advocate in a civil court or assuming the position of guardian over persons not closely connected with him were nothing more than particular applications of the general principle. And so it may be said that in the new Decree we have not so much a new law as a more precise determination of a law already in existence for centuries.

From the general context, but particularly from the list of institutions mentioned as examples of those to be avoided (‘*arcae nummariae, mensae argentariae, rurales, parsimoniales*’), it may be concluded that the object of the law is to exclude clerics from undertakings that are primarily economic or commercial and entail on the part of those who occupy official positions grave responsibility, especially of a financial character. Boards or societies that are mainly political or philanthropic are not affected unless they fulfil the conditions mentioned. The latter, it is true, imply ‘temporal administration,’ and are intended for the temporal good of the people; they might, therefore, seem to fall under the general terms of the Decree (‘*de vetita clericis administratione, instituta opera in temporale fideium auxilium*’); but, apart from the fact that the duties and responsibility involved are of a very different character from those associated with economic or commercial projects, they differ very considerably from the ‘money and savings banks’ which the Decree itself mentions as specimens of the institutions which the phrase ‘*opera in temporale fideium auxilium*’ is intended to cover. ‘*Generi per speciem derogatur*’:² the more general term must be explained by the more particular. In countries, therefore,

¹ Tit. 50.

² Reg. 34 in 6°.

where the clergy have hitherto acted as Members of Parliament, they may continue to do so unaffected by the new Decree, though the object of civil government is primarily the temporal good of the people. On the same principle we should say that clerics in Ireland may continue to act as the people's representatives on the public boards of the country. These boards differ essentially from the 'banks' of the Decree, and the personal pecuniary liability incurred is of a very different description from that of a bank-manager or head of a business institution. Similarly, they may, as far as the Decree is concerned, retain their positions as members or even chairmen of old age pension committees: the work again is philanthropic rather than economic, and the financial responsibility practically nothing. *A fortiori*, they may accept, as hitherto, positions on United Irish League or Gaelic League committees, and continue to fulfil the duties of school-managers: the activity involved may be described as charitable, social, political, or philanthropic, but hardly as commercial or economic in the stricter sense; and in many instances it may be added that the due discharge of the functions mentioned tends as much to the spiritual progress of the community as to its temporal welfare.

On the other hand, if clerics hold responsible positions in connexion with banks or independent insurance societies intended for the use of the general public, or other institutions that, from a financial point of view, should be placed on a similar footing—such as creameries or co-operative associations for buying or selling—they are affected by the new law, and, except with the special permission of Rome, must resign their office. The societies mentioned fulfil all the conditions specified in the Decree: they are primarily of a commercial or economic character and entail all the cares, worries, and responsibilities against which the law wishes to safeguard the members of the clerical state. The fact that clerics themselves make no profit out of these undertakings does not affect the question, for the motives underlying the Decree are quite independent of that consideration. The positions expressly mentioned are those

of president, manager, etc., but others involving similar responsibility—those, for instance, of auditor, accountant, overseer, etc.—would clearly be included among the ‘horum similia.’ And some of the commentators draw attention to the fact that a cleric would not escape the law by setting up another member as a figurehead, and, from a nominally unofficial position, controlling the action of the board and assuming all the real responsibility.¹

While not acting in any of the official capacities mentioned, clerics are exhorted and even commanded to give all the aid in their power towards founding and fostering these benevolent undertakings. They are, therefore, expected to act as advisers, may accept shares in the companies as far as general Canon Law permits, and may even act as delegates or representatives of their local branches on a central council or committee. Some canonists question whether they can accept any position on a committee of management, seeing that every member of such a board is to some extent liable to financial responsibility.² But since, in practice, the real cares of administration are in the hands of those who occupy the positions of president, secretary, treasurer, and the like; since the responsibility of an ordinary member of the committee is little more than that of a shareholder—which, as far as the Decree is concerned, clerics are justified in assuming; since, finally, the decree, without making any distinction between the committee and ordinary shareholders, forbids certain offices and therefore impliedly admits all others, clerics may safely act on such committees until we have further light thrown on the subject by the Roman Congregation.

If in connexion with a friendly society small sums are periodically paid, to be lodged in a bank or distributed on

¹ E.g., J. Besson in the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, Févr., 1911, p. 89. In the *Revue de l'Action populaire* (April 10, 1911) Father Vermeersch, S.J., maintains that the Decree forbids effective and responsible administration, but not either separately. The statement is hardly reconcilable with the words of the text, and is rejected in the *N. R. Théologiques*, May, 1911, p. 302 (note 2).

² See the article ‘Der katholische Geistliche und die Genossenschaftsparkassen,’ etc., in the third number (April 1), 1911, of *Theologie und Glaube*.

certain conditions (in case of sickness, for instance) among certain members of the association, it may be asked whether priests are forbidden to take an official part in forwarding the project. It seems not. The society is not an insurance or banking society in the ordinary sense, and the responsibility entailed is of a very modified character.

It will be noticed that the Decree affects only societies formed for the good of the people. Insurance societies, or others of a similar kind, formed for the clergy and approved by competent ecclesiastical authority, do not come under the law. It would be unreasonable to suppose that the Pontiff intended to put an end to projects of this kind, or to transfer their management entirely to laymen, and the words of the Decree give no ground for the supposition. Of course, a Bishop is not free to approve all manner of institutions formed by the clergy for their own benefit: he must follow the canonical prescriptions already in force, except when they have been modified by extensive and reasonable custom. It may be questioned, too, whether a society established and hitherto managed exclusively by laymen, though for the benefit of the clergy, does not come under the new Decree. But with these exceptions clerical insurance or pension societies, established to meet the case of death, invalidity, sickness, accident, or temporal loss, will remain in their old position unless, as some seem to expect,¹ a new regulation similar to the present be passed for the special benefit of ecclesiastics.

The phrase 'sacri ordinis viri' might at first sight seem to indicate that only those in major orders are included in the prohibition. But the general spirit of the Decree, its title, and the terms elsewhere used throughout ('clerici,' 'clerus,' 'nemo de clero'), tend to show that the Decree applies to all affected by the section of Canon Law dealing 'de vita et honestate clericorum': in other words, that 'ordo sacer' means 'the clerical state,' and covers the case of lay religious and all who have received tonsure.

It can hardly be denied that the Decree, if carried out

¹ Cf. *N. R. Th.*, ib. p. 90.

to the letter, will be occasionally attended with undesirable results, especially in a country like our own where priests have hitherto interested themselves, with the most satisfactory results, in the material affairs of the laity, and where many of the movements that tend to the uplifting of the people depend for their very life on the active support and co-operation of the clergy. The Pope has foreseen all that, however, and made provision for special treatment in exceptional cases. The dispensation provided for has been already sought in countries where the need for it is not so great as in our own.¹ And if suitable representations are made by those in authority we anticipate very little difficulty in securing, where necessary, such relaxations of the general law as will make it compatible with the needs and circumstances of our people.

SUSPENSION 'EX INFORMATA CONSCIENTIA'

REV. DEAR SIR,—Can the suspension *ex informata conscientia* be inflicted for a public crime? Looking over the evidence in some rather famous ecclesiastical cases that have come before the civil courts, I find an astonishing difference of opinion expressed by clerical witnesses on the point. Is there any settled teaching on the point, or is it still a matter of opinion?

SACERDOS.

Considering the words of the famous first chapter of the fourteenth session of Trent, which established the penalty that afterwards came to be known as the suspension *ex informata conscientia*, it is no wonder that many eminent canonists held it might be inflicted for public as well as for occult crimes. Ascent to higher orders and, as subsequent declarations showed,² exercise of orders already received might be prohibited by the Bishop 'even extrajudicially for any cause whatever, even for an occult crime' ('*ex quacumque causa, etiam ob occultum crimen, quomodolibet etiam extrajudicialiter*'). If *even* for occult crimes, then, by implication, it might be said, for others also. So many argued.³

¹ See the Milan *Unions*, Dec., 1910.

² E.g., Bened. xiv., *De Syn.*, l. 12, c. 8, n. 3.

³ E.g., Bouix, *De Jud. Eccl.*, v. ii. pp. 325 sqq.

And the only fairly sound internal evidence to the contrary was found in the fact that in other portions of its Decrees¹ the Council had legislated for public cases, and even confirmed the Constitution *Qualiter et quando* of Innocent III. which prescribed a canonical trial for all cases. The Council could not, it was urged, without self-contradiction, prescribe a course of procedure that would to a very great extent do away with the necessity for the canonical process for which it had specially provided. On this rather doubtful basis the clause 'etiam ob occultum crimen' was taken to mean that 'even hidden crimes were amenable to episcopal jurisdiction,' and could be punished by the infliction of the penalty now prescribed.

Whatever be thought of the reasoning, the fact remains that the majority of canonists, especially in Rome, denied that the Bishop could inflict the penalty for public crimes. To quote a few. Benedict XIV., after giving the Decree, states: 'From this it may be concluded that a Bishop may interdict a cleric from the exercise of orders received for an occult crime, even if known only extrajudicially';² and elsewhere, 'There is no appeal against a suspension from orders, when inflicted for an occult crime or *ex informata conscientia*.'³ Lucidi warns Bishops to 'be careful not to regard public crimes as if they were occult, or inflict suspension *ex informata conscientia* in such cases, for a Decree of the kind would not be sustained.'⁴ And a host of other authorities support the statement.⁵

The Roman decisions have, without exception, as far as we know, been based on the same principle. In the *Acta Sanctae Sedis* we find a record of several. On January 26, 1853, a case connected with the diocese of St. Agatha of the Goths was decided by the Congregation of the Council. The Bishop had suspended the archpriest, D'Ambrosio, from

¹ Sess. xxi. c. 6; Sess. xxiv. cc. v., xx., etc.

² *De Syn. Dioec.*, l. 12, c. 8, n. 3.

³ 'Ob occultum crimen sive ex informata conscientia': *Const., Ad Militantis*, 1742.

⁴ *De Visit. Sac. Lim.*, v. i. p. 386.

⁵ Barbosa, Pirhing, Pignatelli, Gaudentius de Janua, Monacelli, etc.

his dignity and the exercise of orders *ex informata conscientia*. The archpriest had recourse to Rome, urging that the Bishop had acted *ultra vires* in imposing a perpetual suspension, in the manner indicated, for public crimes. The question discussed was, 'An constet de validitate suspensionis in casu,' and the answer given, on the date mentioned, 'Negative, salvo iure episcopo procedendi prout de iure.'¹

A similar case was decided on December 20, 1873. A Bishop, whose name is not given, in order to prevent a priest from following up an appeal from the diocesan court, suspended him in the way mentioned. The priest applied to the Congregation of the Council and asked it to set aside the Decree ('*expostulans revocationem decreti ex inf. conscientia*') on grounds similar to those mentioned in the other case. The answer was: 'Decretum ex informata conscientia in casu non obstare quominus procedatur in causa appellationis prout et quatenus et coram quo de iure.'²

It is open to anyone to say that these two Decrees were set aside, not because the crimes were public, but because the penalty had been inflicted *in perpetuum*, and (in the latter case) because the maxim 'Pendente appellatione nihil innovetur'³ had been violated. But apart from the fact that a perpetual suspension of this kind, though prohibited at present, was often sustained by the Roman Congregation in former times,⁴ the official commentator draws from the two cases the conclusion, '4°. Decretum ex informata conscientia ob crimen publicum editum non sustineri.'⁵

A similar answer was given on September 11, 1880, in the case of a priest who had been suspended from his parochial office for public crimes.⁶ And to come down to more recent times, in a case decided on January 26, 1895, before the Congregation of the Council, the defendant's advocate was able to assert that 'the Congregation had always

¹ *Acta Sanct. Sedis*, vii. p. 574.

² *A. S. S.*, ib.

³ *C. 7, De app.*, in 6°.

⁴ See the decision of the Congregation of the Council, February 3, 1593: 'Caput 1, Sess. 14, Tridentini locum habere in prohibitionibus et suspensionibus tam temporaneis quam perpetuis.'

⁵ *A. S. S.*, v. vii. p. 575.

⁶ *A. S. S.*, v. xiv. p. 298.

revoked suspensions *ex informata conscientia* inflicted for public crimes.¹

These decisions are in perfect harmony with the instructions issued from time to time by the various Roman Congregations. The Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, for instance, published on June 11, 1880, an instruction authorizing Ordinaries in countries not subject to the Propaganda to dispense in clerical cases with some of the formalities required by Canon Law. In the course of it we find :—

IX. . . . Plenam quoque vim servat suam extrajudiciale remedium *ex informata conscientia* pro criminibus occultis, quod decrevit S. Tridentina Synodus in Sess. 14, cap. 1, *de Reform.* adhibendum, cum illis regulis et reservationibus quas constanter servavit pro dicti capituli interpretatione S. Conc. Congregatio in pluribus resolutionibus, et praecipue in *Bosnien. et Sirmien.* 20 Decembris 1873 [the second case quoted above].

And as if to complete the legislation, the Propaganda itself issued a similar Instruction on October 20, 1884 :—

VI. Suspensioni *ex informata conscientia* justam ac legitimam causam praebet crimen seu culpa a suspenso commissa. Haec autem debet esse occulta. . . .

It must be noted, however, that the censure holds if among the charges on which it is based *one* be occult, even though all the others are public. This is clear from several Roman decisions² and from a subsequent paragraph of the instruction just referred to :—

Verum tenet etiam suspensio si, ex pluribus delictis, aliquod fuerit notum in vulgus.³

And the censure is also upheld though the occult crime for which it is imposed become public afterwards :—

(Tenet suspensio) si crimen, quod ante suspensionem fuerat occultum, deinceps post ipsam fuerit ab aliis evulgatum.⁴

¹ *A. S. S.*, v. xxviii. p. 22.

² See *A. S. S.*, vol. xiv. p. 377.

³ No. 8.

⁴ *Ibid.*

Whether a suspension *ex informata conscientia* inflicted for public crime be *ipso jure* null and void is not quite clear. From a consideration of the cases given we should be inclined to hold the affirmative, and many canonists are of that opinion.¹ But others prefer to regard it merely as unlawful; if invalid at all, it is so, they say, only in the wider sense that it will certainly be revoked by Rome when the aggrieved priest has recourse in due form. In practice there is not much difference. The Roman authorities will certainly annul the suspension. In the meantime, considering the difference of opinion and the difficulty often of deciding whether a case is really occult in the canonical sense, the priest so suspended will be well advised to comply with the Bishop's sentence, at least *in foro externo*, until the Roman Congregation has revoked the decision.

M. J. O'DONNELL.

LITURGY

PRIVATE 'REQUIEM' MASSES

REV. DEAR SIR,—Your reply to 'Sacerdos' inquiring as to the number of Low Masses *de Requie* that are allowed on Doubles leaves, to my mind, one practical point still open to discussion. In paragraph 40 you stated 'where the expenses of a Solemn Requiem Mass cannot be provided owing to the poverty of the deceased then a private Mass is permitted. . . .' Now, what if the friends of the poor deceased wished to have *two* Masses on the day of interment, *et presente cadavere*? Could these two Masses be *de Requie* or only one? It occurs to me that the Holy See intended, in allowing a Mass *de Requie* to the poor man on a Double, to give him, in his death, the same privileges as the rich man, and as the rich man under the circumstances could have a Solemn Exequial Mass and any number of Low Masses *de Requie* that the poor man is allowed more than one.

By replying in the I. E. RECORD you shall oblige

ANOTHER SACERDOS.

The precise point raised by our respected correspondent

¹ Cf. Stremler, *D. Peines Ecc.*, 319; *Prael. S. Sulpit.*, iii. 692, etc.

has not been covered by any authentic declaration of the Congregation of Rites that we have seen, but the interpretation which is suggested appears to be quite correct, and may be followed in practice. The private Requiem Mass in the circumstances takes the place of the Solemn Exequial Mass. It has all the privileges of celebration accorded to the latter, and, as nothing is insinuated to the contrary, there is no reason why the occasion should not also be privileged in regard to the number of private Requiem Masses that may be said for the deceased. Hence it may be said that, whenever a private or Low Mass *de Requie* is said in connexion with the Exequial Office *pro paupere defuncto*, then other private *Requiem* Masses are allowed on the same occasion, provided that the usual conditions are fulfilled that are required when the Mass is a solemn one.

**HYMNS AT HOLY THURSDAY AND GOOD FRIDAY
FUNCTIONS**

REV. DEAR SIR,—Kindly let me know (1) is it lawful, during the procession on Holy Thursday, to substitute the hymn 'To Jesus' Heart all Burning' for the *Pange Lingua*, and to have no hymn at all on Good Friday during the procession from the Altar of Repose to the High Altar? I know a parish church where this has happened this year; and it has caused a good deal of adverse criticism, as the people of the parish concerned were always accustomed to hear the *Pange Lingua* and the *Vexilla Regis* during the procession on Holy Thursday and Good Friday respectively.

(2) In blessing new Stations of the Cross, when the Stations, without the crosses, have been hung up in their places on the walls, is it necessary to take them down to bless them on the ground, and then put them back again in their places on the walls after they have been blessed?

SACERDOS.

The object of the first question is not so much to elicit information as to secure the sanction of our authority to condemn the abuses mentioned. Our correspondent is quite right in the view he seems to hold regarding the unlawfulness of substituting an English hymn for the *Pange*

Lingua during the Holy Thursday procession. The use of the vernacular in the Liturgical Offices of the Church is strictly prohibited, except on those occasions for which it has been specially sanctioned—such as Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, and Low Mass, with the Bishop's permission. Moreover, there are some of the liturgical chants of which it is prohibited to make translations, and all vernacular versions must fulfil certain conditions before they can lawfully be employed. Now the Holy Week Offices are strictly liturgical. It is therefore wrong to introduce any vernacular chants into them, and it is also wrong to employ any hymns except those that are prescribed. The omission of the *Vexilla Regis* on Good Friday was also reprehensible. It should not be very difficult to train a choir to sing these hymns in Latin; but if this cannot be done, and if the ceremonies of the Holy Week *Triduum* cannot be carried out in accordance with the minimum required by the *Memoriale Rituum*, then the decorum due to the public worship of the Church obviously demands that they should be omitted altogether.

With regard to the Stations of the Cross, it seems to be forgotten that it is the crosses, and not the pictures, that are to be blessed. The crosses may be blessed either before or after they have been erected. It is merely required that they are morally present to the priest who blesses them.

**POWER OF INTERCESSION OF SOULS IN PURGATORY; AND
'HOLY SOULS' AS TITULAR OF CHURCHES**

REV. DEAR SIR,—At a recent clerical conference the following points came under discussion, and an answer would be gratefully received:—

(1) From what we gather from pious books on Purgatory, I argue that the Holy Souls may *not* be *prayed to* publicly, however much their prayers have availed those who invoke their intercession. Being in a sense prisoners in the 'King's Gaol,' is it lawful to pray *to* them *publicly* in church, and invite the congregation to do so? Has the Church ever permitted this?

(2) How is it allowable to dedicate a church to them, as occurs in Liverpool, Peterborough, etc., when the name of 'Holy Souls'

does *not* surely come under the category of either *Patronus* or *Titulus*?

(3) Do the words 'Omnes Sancti et Sanctae Dei' in the Litanies refer to those in Heaven or on Earth? I only heard lately, for the first time, that it refers to the latter.

AN ENGLISH PRIEST.

An adequate discussion of the first question proposed for solution by our esteemed correspondent would carry us far beyond the limits of space assigned to the Liturgical department of the I. E. RECORD. The question, moreover, has a theological bearing, and this circumstance also must be our apology for dismissing it here in a rather summary manner. It may be said at once that it is at least against the spirit of the Liturgy to offer up public prayers to the Souls in Purgatory or publicly to invoke their intercession. This statement will be justified by a careful perusal of all the prayers and Offices of the Missal and the Breviary. In no instance will there be found traces of a prayer addressed to the Holy Souls. We are indeed exhorted to pray *for* them, but never are we asked to address any petitions *to* them. In the Mass the priest implores for them 'refreshment, light and peace,' but nowhere does he make appeal to their intercession. It is the same with the Breviary. The whole burthen of the Office for the Dead consists in the solicitude of the Church to mitigate the rigours of their punishment and shorten the term of their exile from their true home. Indeed, the intense anxiety displayed in the Liturgy to obtain succour for them rather suggests the utter helplessness of their present condition. When we come to consider the theological grounds on which the public practice of the Liturgy rests we shall find that the advisability or utility of praying to the Holy Souls depends on whether it is possible for them to become aware of our petitions, and whether, knowing our wants, they are in a position to move God by impetration to help us. There is nothing defined about either of these two points, and so they are freely discussed by theologians.¹ There does not seem to

¹ See Coghlan, *De Deo Creatore*, p. 650.

be much solid reason for denying to the Holy Souls the power of impetration: for they are the friends of God, and, though they are now in a state of suffering, this circumstance does not cause any real hostility between them and the Divine Majesty or prevent them from appealing to the Divine mercy, liberality, and goodness. The chief difficulty in the matter of praying to those souls comes from their apparent inability to hear our prayers. In the case of the saints, they can know what we ask of them, because they have the knowledge of all things in the Beatific Vision which they enjoy. But the Souls in Purgatory have no such source of knowledge, and they cannot become cognizant of our prayers unless God adopts some rather extraordinary means of revealing our wants to them, or unless we conceive them as impetrating God in a general way for such as may have had recourse to their intercessory offices. Suarez says it is possible for God to manifest our desires to the suffering souls through the ministry of angels. But such a method of conveying knowledge does not harmonize with the ordinary Providence of God. Of course, they retain in Purgatory all the knowledge of things they possessed in this life, and it may be supposed that, so far as this light leads them, they will pray for those here below whom they realize to be in need of their suffrages. The practical utility, therefore, of praying to the Holy Souls remains of a very doubtful character. It has, possibly, in its favour the *communis sensus fidelium*. To this it may be answered that when we pray to the souls of deceased friends we do not exactly contemplate them as in Purgatory and believe that they can help us efficiently here, but we rather imagine that they have passed beyond the region of suffering and are already installed in their rest eternal. What has been said will in no way affect the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, since the spiritual solidarity of this union will still be maintained by our power to help the Souls, even though they in turn cannot for the present reciprocate our kindly forethought. Owing, then, to the uncertainty that prevails in regard to the matter the Church is slow to sanction public prayers to the Souls in Purgatory, and accordingly she

reserves the public offices of the Liturgy for those whom she declares authoritatively to have received possession of the imperishable reward.

All this will make clear the reasonableness of our correspondent's second question. Both the Titulars and Patrons of Churches are entitled to receive the public cult of the Liturgy, for their Feasts must be celebrated each year with circumstances of great pomp and solemnity. Their Office has even an Octave. Now, if the public cult of the Liturgy cannot, with the sanction of the Church, be given to the Souls in Purgatory, how justify the dedication of a Church in their honour? There is, indeed, every latitude allowed for the naming of the Titular. Any Divine Mystery, any Mystery relating to the Blessed Virgin, any member of the ordinary Angelic Choirs, or any Canonized Saint may be freely chosen, but Ritualists do not suggest the title about which there is question. Further, the rubrical inadvisability of this selection appears from the fact that one who is merely *beatified* cannot be appointed Titular without an Indult of the Holy See.¹ Some of the Liturgical authorities, however, would justify the dedication to the Holy Souls, provided the intention is not so much to honour them and appoint them intercessors, but rather to make them the special objects for which prayers are offered up in this particular church. In this way they are not to be regarded as Titulars in the true sense for neither can mention of them be made, for the reason already given, in the prayer *A Cunctis*, nor can they have the regular Office. It seems, then, a pretty hard task to justify their selection at all, unless we presume that the authority of the Holy See was sought and obtained.

As to the final point in this query, anyone who carefully studies the construction of the Litany of the Saints will hardly fail to discover the true meaning of the invocation referred to. In the beginning of the Litany, it will be observed, the Divine Persons are invoked, then the Blessed Virgin, next the Angels, and, finally, the Saints, grouped together in classes or categories according to their order of

¹ See *Decreta S. R. C.*, nn. 2809, 2353.

dignity. Only certain remarkable individuals are mentioned in each category, but at the end there is a general or comprehensive invocation addressed to all belonging to it. Now, as the last invocation of each class is meant to embrace all the saints pertaining to this category whose names are not expressly mentioned, so the last invocation of all—*Omnes Sancti et Sanctae Dei*—includes all the Saints belonging to all the classes; and as there is question in the previous invocations not of Saints on earth but of those in heaven, so in the invocation under discussion there is question of the latter and of these alone. The word *intercedite* would also suggest the same. It is stronger than *orate* and implies a higher degree of worthiness in the mediator, and so, whilst we often ask saints on earth to *pray* for us, we rarely supplicate their intercession.

SELLING BLESSED CANDLES

REV. DEAR SIR,—I would be much obliged if you could, in your next issue of the I. E. RECORD state whether there is a prohibition of the Church to sell blessed candles. I have found Decrees condemning the sale of Rosaries, etc. May I also ask if Rosaries, and Crosses made of precious stones and gold, respectively, come under the aforesaid Decrees?—Yours, etc.

SACERDOS.

The Decree of the Congregation about the sale of *indulged* objects—such as Rosaries, Medals, Crosses, etc.—is very strict. It prohibits under pain of losing the indulgences the acceptance of any offerings, ‘quocumque Titulo sive pretii, sive permutationis, sive muneris, sive elemosynae,’ on the occasion of imparting indulgences to objects.¹ There is no exception made, so that objects of high value are included just the same as those of inferior quality. Where the articles are of very precious material and a price is expected for them, they should be sold first and afterwards blessed.

In the blessing of candles there is no indulgence granted, and hence they do not come under the Decree above men-

¹ July 16, 1887.

tioned. Neither can we discover any other authoritative declaration which prohibits the acceptance of the cost price of the candles after they have been blessed. It would, of course, be wrong to demand more for the candles in consideration of their blessing than they originally cost ; for this would be setting a price on the blessing and would savour of simony. It may be that even here, as, for instance, on the Feast of the Purification, prices are demanded in certain churches for blessed candles in *excess* of what they cost. Where such a custom prevails the excess might possibly be justified on the ground of a voluntary offering or some other extrinsic title, so that, if the practice was free from simoniacal suspicions and had the sanction of authority, it might be continued.

P. MORRISROE.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE PRIESTS OF MARY

PAROCHIAL HOUSE,

STREETE,

CO. WESTMEATH,

May 3, 1911.

VERY REV. DEAR SIR,—I am presuming on the gracious reception always accorded in the columns of the I. E. RECORD to any contribution regarding the progress of the 'Association of the Priests of Mary' to direct the attention of your readers to the fact that during the last year a *Revue des Prêtres de Marie*, has been published in France, and has already obtained a large circulation amongst the thousands of members enrolled in that country. The annual subscription 'pour l'étranger' is 1 fr. 50 c., and a Postal Order for 1s. 6d. will secure its transmission, post free, six times a year.

The address of publisher is Bureau du Regne de Jésus par Marie. St. Laurent-sur-Sevre (Vendée).

As there is a likelihood of a considerable accession to the Society amongst the young priests who would thus be encouraged to perpetuate the practice of devotion to Our Lady which they observed in their College Sodality, I may be allowed to mention that to prevent delay or difficulty I will be glad to send in names of applicants for registration to the Central Director in Rome, and to furnish them with the usual certificates at once. No fee is required, although it is left optional to make a small offering in honour of the Blessed Virgin, which I will forward to Father Gebhard.

Trusting that you will pardon me for this intrusion,

I remain,

Very Rev. Dear Sir,

Yours respectfully,

THOMAS M'GEOY, P.P.

DOCUMENTS

DECREE OF SACRED CONGREGATION OF RELIGIOUS
REGARDING LAY BROTHERS

S. CONGREGATIO DE RELIGIOSIS

DECRETUM QUOAD LAICOS ORDINUM RELIGIOSORUM

Sacrosanta Dei Ecclesia Ordines Religiosos decorandos voluit solemnitate votorum, quo status prosequentium in eis evangelica consilia fieret aestimatione et effectu in christiana societate stabilior. Ad quae vota solemniter profitenda eos quoque admittit, qui nulla Sacerdotii Christi participatione donati, Conversi seu Laici vocantur.

Quum vero per votorum solemnitatem prorsus irrevocabili, arctissimo et publico nexu mancipetur homo divino servitio coram Ecclesia et fidelibus universis, decet omnino, ut qui, hac ratione, Christi vestigia se propius ac perpetuo secuturos sponderunt, ii fideliter in sua promissione perseverent. Quod praesertim de Laicis seu Conversis dicendum est, quos nonnisi admiratione summa et scandalo cernerent fideles, post solemnem professionem ad saecularia vota redire, nullo a se vitae prioris signo distinctos.

Spiritus autem temporum, qui omnimodam libertatem infausto vindicat hominibus, sancta quoque Monasteriorum septa est furtim praetergressus; idque etiam effecit, ut cum desiderio vitae humilioris, absconditae in Christo, qualis Conversorum solet esse in Coenobiis, propositi perseverantia simul imminueretur, in iis praesertim Laicis, quos forsitan religiosos potius fecerat necessitas, quam voluntas, vel quos Superiores absque debitis cautelis exceperant, vel quos acceptis a Deo beneficiis abuti contigerat. Hos, parvi facientes verba Sancti Augustini: *Nec ideo te vovisse poeniteat, imo gaude iam tibi non licere quod cum tuo detrimento licuisset. Aggredere itaque intrepidus et dicta imple factis; ipse adiuvabit, qui vota tua expetit. Felix est necessitas, quae in meliora compellit* (S. Aug., Ep. 127-8), mater Ecclesia, studens minori malo, licet non sine magna commiseratione, aliquando permisit abire.

Ut igitur dignitas votorum, quae etiam Laici solemniter ritu promittunt, in laude, qua in Ecclesia merito gaudent, perseveret, et ad sanctum vocationis propositum impensiore cura

provehendum, nostra difficillima aetate, haec Sacra Congregatio, Negotiis Religiosorum Sodalium praeposita, rem attentissime in Domino consideravit, discussis sedulo causis, propositisque mediis ac remediis; sententiamque expetivit quum Moderatorum Generalium praecipuorum Ordinum, tum plurium ex suis Consultoribus. Quae omnia E^mi Patres Cardinales Sacri eiusdem Consessus, in Plenario Coetu, die 29 Iulii anno 1910 ad Vaticanum habito, diligentissime perpendentes, quaedam statuenda rati sunt, quae Laicorum ingressum, tyrocinium, institutionem, votorum emissionem in posterum opportune moderentur.

Haec igitur erunt apprime servanda ab omnibus Religiosis Familiis, apud quas a Conversis quoque solemnia vota nuncupantur, nimirum:

1. Moderatoribus Generalibus facultas fit permittendi toties quoties Superioribus Provincialibus, ut excipere valeant eos quoque iuvenes, ad Laicorum munia destinatos, qui vix expleverint decimum septimum aetatis annum, servatis servandis.

2. Nemo ad Novitiatum admittatur, qui per duos saltem annos, vel per plures, si magis diuturnum experimentum Constitutiones Ordinis praescribant, postulatum non expleverit, sub poena invalidae postea professionis.

3. Novitiatu ante vigesimum primum aetatis annum initium non habeat, ad tramitem iuris vigentis; isque unum vel etiam duos annos perduret, iuxta proprii Ordinis Constitutiones.

4. Expleto Novitiatu, servatisque quae servanda sunt, Laici admitti possunt ad simplicem votorum professionem, quae quidem, perpetua ex parte voventis, sit ad tempus sexennii ex parte Ordinis.

5. Absoluto sexennio votorum simplicium et expleto trigesimo aetatis anno ac non prius, sub poena item invaliditatis, servatisque pariter servandis, Laici vota solemnia nuncupare poterunt.

6. Quae in praecedentibus articulis respiciunt professionem votorum simplicium et solemnium erunt quoque servanda quoad Laicos nunc in Coenobiis viventes, qui solemnem professionem nondum nuncuparunt.

Spatium hoc sat diuturnum novem annorum sperandum est, fore ut quum Superioribus tum tyronibus opportunitatem det explorandi illinc voluntatem, hinc vitae institutum, ad quod postea solemniter amplectendum, virtute firmior, potest homo maturius afferre iudicium.

Haec autem aliquam, non tamen omnino firmam darent per-

severentiae spem, nisi ea comitentur sequentes et aliae id genus cautelae et industriae, quas Apostolica Sedes, decursu saeculorum, edixit vel adhibendas suasit, et observantiores Familiae Religiosae laudabili consuetudine et felici exitu expertae sunt.

Et in primis quoad Conversorum receptionem, multae sunt eaeque sedulae adhibendae cautelae et inquisitiones praemitendae. Provincialis indagat oportet de legitimitate natalium de morum honestate, de optima coram populo fama, de idoneitate tyronum, ac praesertim de natura finis, quo ipsi aguntur, amplectendi statum Religiosum. Plures enim sunt, qui Religionem ingressi, non videntur commoda dereliquisse, sed quaerere; qui quaerunt *in Monasterio quae nec foris habere potuerunt* (Reg., S. Aug., c. i. 3), quique facilem vitam curarumque expertem, immerito nominis honore, gerere cupiunt. Hi sane non sunt, quibus cum Sancto Augustino exclamare fas est: *Quam suave mihi subito factum est carere suavitatibus nugarum, et quas amittere metus fuerat, iam dimittere gaudium erat!* (S. Aug., Conf., l. 9, c. i.). Erunt quidem hi habitu Religiosi, non virtute, quos rectius fuerat in saeculo ambulasse per plana, quam ad altiora tendentes forsitan in discrimen suam aeternam vocare salutem.

Quos factae, etiam secreto, inquisitiones et exhibita documenta serio commendaverint, ii tantum, praehabita de more maiorum Superiorum licentia, ad Postulatum admittantur.

Satis exploratum est, habet Clemens VIII. in Instructione *Cum ad regularem* (n. 22), super receptione et educatione Novitiorum, *perfectam educationem Conversorum tum Religioni decorem et ornamentum, tum aliis Christifidelibus aedificationem, exemplum atque utilitatem afferre*. Necesse igitur est, ut statim ab ipso initio eorum animus spiritus Religiosus et Ordinis totum pervadat. *Qui disciplinam in novae conversationis initio negligit, ad eam postmodum difficile applicatur, et formam, quam primo quis recipit, vix deponit* (S. Bonaventura, in *Spec. Disc.*, prolog. n. 1).

Ad hoc assequendum praeficiatur Postulantibus Pater, quem et aetas probaverit et vita, cui dicit sanctus Bernardus: *Zelum tuum inflammet caritas, informet scientia, firmet constantia* (S. Bernardus, Serm. 20, n. 4, Cant.), et de quo Sanctus Gregorius Magnus scripsit (Reg. Past., p. 2, c. 6): *Curandum quippe est ut rectorem subditis et matrem pietas et patrem exhibeat disciplina. Atque inter haec sollicita circumspectione providendum, ne aut districtio rigida, aut pietas sit remissa. . . Miscenda ergo est lenitas cum severitate; faciendum quoddam ex utraque temperamentum,*

ut neque multa asperitate exulcerentur subditi, neque nimia benignitate solvantur.

Saepe ab ipsa civili educatione initium ducendum est ; quum inferioris soleant esse fortunae qui Laicorum numero petunt adscribi. Inurbanitas in agendi modis, in responsionibus dandis, in incessu, in ipsa corporis sumenda refectione, erit paulatim, sed omnino, evellenda. Sordidi habitus, quos sibi non amor humilitatis et contemptus mundi sollicite elegit, sed rudis negligentia foedavit, non olent spiritum Christi, ideoque non semper bene de iis, quorum corpora tegunt, annuntiant. Corporis habitusque mundities, comite semper modestia ac simplicitate, erit summopere curanda. Quas item in mundo civilis educatio moderatas regulas constituit humani consortii, eas caritas quoque fraterna adhibendas suadet etiam in Coenobiis, quum caritatis sit, quidquid proximum perturbare potest, attente defugere. Inurbanitas autem, quae ex studio sui commodi procedit sum aliorum neglectu, non potest quin molestiam aliis inferat detque occasionem patientiae.

Externe haec sese habendi compositio viam sternit animo plenius educando, iis scilicet nobilibus sensibus infundendis, quibus mens trahitur ad aliorum levem quamque offensionem vitandam, desideria praevenianda, gratum animum facile demonstrandum, alios sibi praeferendos.

Haec tamen singula informet oportet, regat ac nobilitet caritas Christi, ita ut quidquid verbis, operibus, omissionibus nostris laudabile est ac proximo gratum, procedat ex corde pleno caritatis.

Quae omnia, si Laicos decent, summopere eminere debent in Sacerdotibus et iis, qui ad sacerdotium erunt promovendi, quorum igitur Laici intuentes exempla, pertrahantur non solum ad virtutis, sed etiam ad modestae urbanitatis tramitem prosequendum.

Monitis, hortamentis, patientia ac praesertim exemplo, rudiorum quoque non erit difficile in urbanos et amabiles ita convertere mores ac modos, ut, non multo post eorum ingressum in Religionem, de ipsis repetere liceat illud Sancti Bernardi : *Induerunt sibi faciem disciplinatam, et bonam totius corporis compositionem . . . sermo rarior, vultus hilarior, aspectus verecundior, incessus maturior. Verum, quia haec noviter coepere, ipsa sui novitate flores censenda sunt et spes fructuum, magis quam fructus* (Serm. 63, in Cant., n. 6).

Fructus hos quidem gignet institutio spiritualis, cui toti sint

cum Postulantibus Praepositus, et cum Novitiis Magister. Laicorum profectum in viam sanctitatis faciant ipsi opus et lucrum suum, opus et lucrum sane nobile et ingens.

Ad norman Decretorum Apostolicae Sedis, eis explicent universam doctrinam christianam, praesertim quoad sacramenta confessionis et communionis rite et fructuose percipienda, prae oculis habentes Catechismum Concilii Tridentini ad Parochos. Simul eos doceant, quasnam obligationes secum trahat votorum professio, quid exigant votis respondentes virtutes. Eas quoque explanent Regulae et Constitutionum partes, quae ad Conversos pertinent.

Habeantur statis diebus collectiones seu sermones ad Laicos, non tantum vero ad novos, sed ad omnes, seniores quoque votorum professione et aetate; quibus collectionibus seu sermonibus argumentum sint non solum catechismus, vitae spiritualis monita, Regulae et Constitutionem explanatio, verum etiam normae practicae et exempla modestae moderataeque urbanitatis.

Laicorum autem animum iis virtutibus ac praesidiis Superiores roborare satagant, quae Laicorum status, praecipua quadam ratione, reposcit, nempe humilitate obedientia, spiritu orationis ac sanctificatione laboris.

Et in primis, exteriorem et cordis humilitatem studeant assequi Laici. *Nec aliam tibi . . . viam munias, quam quae munita est ab illo, qui gressuum nostrorum tamquam Deus vidit infirmitatem. Ea est autem prima humilitas, secunda humilitas, tertia humilitas: et quoties interrogas, hoc dicerem* (S. Augustinus, Ep. 118, n. 22). Nam, ut habet divus Bernardus (*De Cons.*, l. 5, c. 14, n. 32): *Virtutum . . . stabile fundamentum, humilitas . . . ; si nutet illa, virtutum aggregatio non nisi ruina est.* Quod ita explicat Sanctus Thomas: *Humilitas primum locum tenet, in quantum scilicet expellit superbiam, cui Deus resistit, et praebet hominem subditum et semper patulum ad suscipiendum influxum divinae gratiae, in quantum evacuat inflationem superbiae; ut dicitur Iac. IV., quod Deus superbis resistit, humilibus autem dat gratiam; et secundum hoc, humilitas dicitur spiritualis aedificii fundamentum* (II. II., q. 161, art. 5, ad 2).

Quum vero ad veram humilitatem inducat frequens in despectis operibus exercitatio, dicente Sacra Scriptura quod numquam ad humilitatis virtutem perveniet qui opera humilitatis refugit (B. Alb. M., *de Par. Animae*, c. 2), muneribus quibus funguntur, eo potissimum debent gaudere Laici, quod humilitatis exercendae et augendae veluti indeficientem habeant opportunitatem.

Excellat quoque in Laicis obedientia. Noverint in ea nullum esse peccandi periculum: cum ea, certissima est victoria, inexpugnabile tutamen, merita plurima, pax summa. Sit autem oportet munita supernaturalibus motivis. Iuxta Sanctorum documenta, rectores nostri sunt vicarii Dei super nos. Et ideo debemus eis sicut Domino obedire et non sicut hominibus, quia non propter ipsos, sed propter Deum eis subiaceamus. Ac Sanctus Gregorius Magnus docet: *Vera namque obedientia nec praepositorum intentionem discutit, nec praecepta discernit. . . . Qui obedientiae bonum exsequitur, non iniunctum opus debet considerare, sed fructum* (In I. Reg., l. 2, c. 4, n. 11). Quapropter Sanctus Bernardus merito improperat eorum obedientiam, qui *non in omnibus parati sunt obsequi, non per omnia sequi proposuerunt eum, qui non suam, sed Patris venit facere voluntatem. Discernunt et diiudicant, eligentes in quibus obediant imperanti* (In conv. S. Pauli, Serm. I., n. 6); et quos constat, iuxta eundem Sanctum Bernardum, *nec unquam libenter obedire, nisi cum audire contigerit quod forte libuerit, aut quod non aliter licere seu expedire monstraverit vel aperta ratio, vel indubitata auctoritas* (De praec. et dispensat., c. 10, n. 23). Huic exercendae virtuti validissimum dent auxilium et animum verba et exempla, Christi Iesu, qui non desiit asseverare: *Descendi de coelo, non ut faciam voluntatem meam. Non quaero voluntatem meam, sed voluntatem eius, qui misit me. Sicut mandatum dedit mihi Pater, sic facio. Ego quae placita sunt ei, facio semper. Meus cibus est, ut faciam voluntatem eius, qui misit me, ut perficiam opus eius. Pater mi, . . . non sicut ego volo, sed sicut tu* (Ioan. vi. 38; v. 30; xiv. 31; viii. 29; iv. 34; Matth. xxvi. 39); quique *factus est obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis* (Philip. ii. 8).

Spiritus quoque orationis erit magnopere provehendus. *Orandi diligentia tibi in primis necessaria est: impenetrabilis enim armatura, certum perfugium, securus portus, tutissimumque asylum est oratio. Haec una et mala omnia depellit ab anima, et bona omnia in illam invehit. Ipsam animam purgat, poenam peccatis debitam submovet, praeteritas negligentias sarcit, divinam gratiam impetrat, pravas concupiscentias extinguit, effrenatas animi passiones domat, hostes prosternit, tentationes superat, calamitates lenit, moerorem fugat, laetitiam infundit, pacem conciliat, hominem Deo coniungit, coniunctumque ad aeternam gloriam sublevat. Precando impetrabis quidquid utile tibi fuerit* (Lud. Blosius, Canon vitae spirit., c. 17, n. 1). Clemens VIII. ad Conversorum religiosam institutionem id quoque praescrisit: *Pro eorum capa-*

citae et commoditate, de spiritualibus, praesertim de modo mentaliter orandi, diligenter instruendi erunt (Instr. super rec. et educ. Novit., n. 22).

Curandum igitur est, ut bene noscant Laici virtutem et exercitium orationis; ut statis horis orationi quum mentali tum vocali fideliter vacent; ut tempus ad hoc statutum in Constitutionibus Ordinis unice orationi integrumque dicent; nec satis sit eos meditationi operam dare, quum Missis inserviunt. Indagent autem Superiores, praesertim postquam Laici tyrocinium absolverint, utrum meditationi et orationibus incumbant.

Brevium quoque orationum, quas iaculatorias vocant, sit ipsis usus continuus inter diem. Compendiosa est enim via ad consequendam animae unionem cum Deo, ad merita augenda, ad rectam intentionem servandam, ad tentationes praeripiendas et superandas, ad omnia sanctitate extollenda.

Manuale opus, quod in Coenobiis est munus Laicorum praecipuum, pariter sanctificent, non ad oculum servientes, non laudis expetentes praemium, sed unice voluntatis Dei ac Superiorum solliciti. *Quam pudendum et dolendum est, si delectat labor, ut . . . cuppa et saeculus impleatur . . . et non delectat, ut Deus acquiratur (S. August., De bon. vid., c. 21). Quanta apud Deum merces, si in praesenti pretium non sperarent! Quantis sudoribus haereditas cassa expetitur! Minori labore margaritum Christi emi poterat (S. Hieron. ad Nep., di vita cler. et monac., 6).*

Habeant tandem prae oculis monita Sancti Bonaventurae; *Continue mentem tuam ita habeas ordinatam cum Deo, quod omne opus tuum atque exercitium tam mentis quam corporis sit oratio, omniaque servitia, et maxime humiliora cum tanto facias caritatis fervore, ac si ea Christo corporaliter exhiberes. Quod certe debes et potes veraciter cogitare, quoniam ipse dixit in Evangelio: Quod uni ex minimis meis fecistis, mihi fecistis.—Scias indubitanter, carissime frater, quod nisi perfecte abnegaveris temetipsum, sequi non poteris vestigia Salvatoris et sine sollicitudine continua et labore eius gratiam adipisci nequibis, et nisi assidue pulsaveris portas eius, ingredi non poteris ad pacem mentis, et nisi te instanter in timore Dei tenueris, cito domus tua corruet in profundum (Memorial., n. 19 et 25, conclus.).*

Ad quae omnia consequenda Laici sacrae mensae assidui sint per frequentem, imo etiam quotidianam SSimae Eucharistiae sumptionem ad normam recentiorum instructionum Apostolicae Sedis. Itemque omnino peculiarem colant devotionem erga Deiparam Virginem Mariam, quam ut suam amantissimam matrem semper invocare, honorare et imitari conentur.

Curent quoque Superiores, ut Sacerdotes et Laici mutuam sibi summamque observantiam et caritatem adhibeant. Revererantur Laici Presbyteros, a quibus ministeria ac mysteria maxima accipiunt. Honorent Presbyteri Laicos et *studeant . . . de pauperum fratrum societate gloriari* (Reg., S. Aug., c. I., 5). Id meminerint Sacerdotes, plurimos in Religiosis Ordinibus Laicos, ab humilioribus occupationibus, quibus per vitam functi fuerant, ad altarium honores evectos et inter beatos Coelites post mortem adnumeratos fuisse. Illud igitur genus vitae in Laicis pia colant observantia, quod tam frequenti et mirificae sanctitati aditum patefecit.

Ne gravitate munerum exercendorum in Conventu Laici superbiant, animo efferantur et parvi faciant ipsos Sacerdotes, officia graviora cuiusvis generis ne demandentur eis, nisi necessitate cogente, idque fiat semper sub omnimoda dependentia et obedientia alicuius patris gravioris aetatis et consilii, cui agendorum et gestorum ipsi rationem fideliter reddant.

Haec sufficiant de plurimis pauca.

Ceterum haec Sacra Congregatio summopere confidit, fore ut Superiores Generales omnium Ordinum Religiosorum ad simile vitae studium pro viribus provocare nitantur suos Laicos. Sic eorum vigilet tolerantia, ut non dormiat disciplina. Nam *nil tam fixum animo, quod neglectu et tempore non obsolescat* (S. Bern., de Cons., l. I, c. 2). *In hoc enim differunt laudabiles religiones et iam dilapsae, non quod nullus peccans in laudabilibus reperiatur, sed quod nullus impune peccare sinatur, et peccandi aditus studiose praeccludantur, et incorrigibiles et alios inficientes eliminentur, et boni joveantur et diligantur, ut perseverent et in melius semper proficiant* (S. Bonavent., De sex alis Seraph., c. 2, n. 13).

Quibus omnibus Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Pio Papa X. relatis, Sanctitas Sua ea rata habere et confirmare dignata est, contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus, etiam speciali mentione dignis.

Datum Romae, ex Secretaria Sacrae Congregationis de Religiosis, die I Ianuarii 1911.

FR. I. C. CARD. VIVES, *Praefectus*.

✠ DONATUS, *Archiep. Ephesinus., Secretarius*.

L. ✠ S.

PUBLICATION OF DECREES OF SACRED CONGREGATION OF
RELIGIOUS

S. CONGREGATIO DE RELIGIOSIS

CIRCA EVULGATIONEM DECRETORUM HUIUS SACRAE

CONGREGATIONIS

Apostolica Sedes, admodum sollicita provehendae perfectionis inter Religiosas utriusque sexus Familias, plures edidit easque saluberrimas leges, quibus quaedam vetantur, quaedam praescribuntur, ad Sodalium ingressum, institutionem, vota, studia, vitae externae rationem aliaque id genus apte modicanda.

Inter quas leges, nonnullae tanti ponderis sunt, ut, iis non servatis, quidam actus invalidi, alii poenis ecclesiasticis multati, omnes autem saltem illiciti sint.

Saepe vero contingit, ut quae Apostolica Sedes sapienter constituit, ad notitiam omnium Congregationum vel Domorum Religiosarum, praesertim Monialium, non perveniant, legum beneficio sic prorsus amisso. Ita, in exemplum, dicendum de Decretis: *Singulari quidem*, 27 Martii 1896, quoad quaestuationem; *Perpensis*, 3 Maii 1902, de triennali experimento solemni professioni religiosae praemittendo; *Quemadmodum*, 17 Decembris 1890, de relatione conscientiae; *Sacra Tridentina Synodus*, 20 Decembris 1905, de Communionem frequenti; *Inter ea*, 7 Septembris 1909, de debitis contrahendis; *Ecclesia Christi*, 7 Septembris 1909, de quibusdam Postulantibus in Religiosas Familias non admittendis; *Sanctissimum*, 4 Ianuarii 1910, quo praecedens decretum ad religiosas mulierum Familias extenditur, et de aliis.

Haec igitur Sacra Congregatio Negotiis Religiosorum Sodalium praeposita, summopere commendat Revm̄is locorum Ordinariis eorumque Delegatis seu Deputatis ad Monasteria, praesertim Monialium, quae Domum sui iuris constituunt, nec generalem Superiorissam habent, ut notitiam Decretorum, etiam in posterum edendorum, quae vitam religiosam respiciunt, efficaciter evulgent inter Religiosas Familias et Instituta quoque Dioecesana, ad abusum, si qui irrepserint, tollendos, ad bonum largius diffundendum et uniformitatem in rerum canonicarum observantiam ubique obtinendam.

Datum Romae, ex Secretaria Sacrae Congregationis de Religiosis, die 3 Iulii 1910.

FR. I. C. CARD. VIVES, *Praefectus*.

F. CHERUBINI, *Subsecretarius*.

LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS X. TO THE ARCH-
BISHOP OF COMPOSTELLA

AD IOSEPHUM M. CARD. MARTIN DE HERRERA Y DE LA IGLESIA,
ARCHIEPISCOPUM COMPOSTELLANUM, OB LITTERAS OBSEQUII
DEVOTIONISQUE PLENAS BEATISSIMO PATRI EXHIBITAS

Dilecte Fili Noster, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.—
Plurimum, uti par est, te Sedis Apostolicae auctoritati ac magisterio tribuere vel ex litteris intelleximus, quas nuper ad Nos dedisti. Recensebas quippe in eis ac celebrando recolebas quae postremis hisce temporibus edidimus documenta cum ad tuendam catholicae fidei integritatem, tum etiam ad christianam morum disciplinam provehendam firmandam. Id certo in gerendo Pontificatu maximo ad hunc diem pro viribus studuisse videmur, fidei pietatisque popularis excitato studio, redintegrari late in civitatibus christianam indolem, christianaque instituta omnia ita florere, ut ad renovandos ad sanctitatem animos—qua sane re nostra tanto opere indiget aetas—quam maxime conferant. Et utinam omnes quotquot sunt, qui catholicis accensentur, pronis auribus verba Nostra excipiant: optimis dignae Ecclesiae temporibus virtutes revirescent laudesque christianae. Tu interim, Dilecte Fili, curarum Nostrarum ac laborum consors, consilia coeptaque Nostra perge alacritate omni fovere, urgere. Certanti tibi bonum fidei certamen is aderit, qui te in hac perdifficili ac plena formidinis tempestate, posuit episcopum regere ecclesiam. Quod quidem ut felicius eveniat, auspicem divinorum munerum Nostraeque benevolentiae testem, apostolicam benedictionem tibi, Dilecte Fili Noster, tuoque Clero ac populo peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die XX mensis Octobris MCMX,
Pontificatus Nostri anno octavo.

PIUS PP. X.

FACULTIES TO DISPENSE IN AGE AND INTERSTICES
GRANTED TO IRISH BISHOPS

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE SACRAMENTIS

2105/II.

Bñe Pater,

Michael Cardinalis Logue, Archiepiscopus Armacan., humiliter petit a S.V. pro omnibus Episcopis Hiberniae, renovationem ad quinquennium facultatis ipsis concessae Die 30 Maii 1904, dispensandi scilicet cum propriis subditis in Collegio Maynutiano

et in Collegio S. Patricii apud Lutetiam Parisiorum ad sacros ordines promovendis super interstitiis et super defectum unius anni aetatis ad Presbyteratum requisitae.

Die 24 Maii 1911, S. C. de Disciplina Sacramentorum, vigore facultatum sibi a SS. D. N. Pio Papa X. tributarum, attentis expositis, gratiam prorogationis iuxta petita ad quinquennium benigne tribuit, servata in reliquis forma praecedentis rescripti.

M. BOVIERI,

Sub-Secretarius.

ARCH. BRUNI, *Off.*

NOTICES OF BOOKS

HOME RULE FINANCE. An Experiment in Justice. By
T. M. Kettle. Dublin : Maunsel & Co. 1911.

THIS is by far the ablest and most important statement that has yet been made in the present phase of the Financial Relations question. Our first feeling on reading it is one of deep regret that Mr. Kettle is not in Parliament to support by his brilliant advocacy the claims that he has so lucidly established in this volume.

In the early part of the volume Mr. Kettle does excellent service by analysing and reducing to its primitive elements the return of the White Papers for 1910, according to which £2,357,500 more is spent every year on Irish administration than is received from Irish revenue of all kinds. Mr. Kettle has left no aspect of this argument against the bankruptcy of Home Rule unanswered. It is a brilliant and most effective piece of work, particularly useful and telling at the present moment.

Mr. Kettle is quite right, it seems to us, in not seeking to enter into a discussion of this question with people who are hardened in opposition to Home Rule, and whose only object is to turn the situation to account in every way they can against it. But for all men of good will who have minds open to argument he enters into a close analysis of the various items of expenditure which constitute what he appropriately calls the 'Blood Money of Empire.'

As a practical proposition at the end of his argument, Mr. Kettle suggests the appointment of an Irish Advisory Committee of financial experts, who would help Mr. Redmond and the Party to safeguard Irish interests in this great emergency. This is a matter of the greatest importance to the material prosperity of Ireland in the future. As Mr. Kettle well says, liberty must be the soul of Home Rule ; but there is a body to be considered also, and wise men should not ignore its wants and claims. Let the best men be got *who are friends to Home Rule*, and let them show in a spirit of patriotism and loyalty

where the weak points are and where the danger centres. This is Mr. Kettle's proposal, and seems to us, if carried out in a reasonable spirit, without any personal end to be served, to merit serious consideration.

J. F. H.

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. Vol. X. London: The Caxton Publishing Co. New York: Robert Appleton Co. 1911.

VOLUME X. of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* begins with 'Mass' and ends with 'Newman.' It covers a very wide area and abounds in interesting matter. The illustrations are excellent. Such questions as 'Modernism,' by Father Vermeersch; 'Monothelism,' by Dom Chapman, 'Neum,' by Rev. H. Bewerunge, are treated admirably. The papers of M. Georges Goyau are models of their kind; those on Napoleon I., Napoleon III., and Montalembert being the most important. There is a very interesting paper on Mexico and another on Munich. There is a long article on Münster in Westphalia; but Munster in Ireland has not been thought worthy of a commemoration. Dr. Barry deals interestingly with Newman, but seems rather too ready to believe that the great Cardinal was not treated 'with due regard' in Ireland. It made no matter whether Archbishop MacHale was treated with due regard or not. That was a matter of no importance. At all events we have found this volume on the whole satisfactory, and we are glad that the Editors have got beyond the 'mezzo del cammin.'

J. F. H.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE LEADERS OF MODERN SCIENCE. By Karl Alois Kneller, S.J. Translated from the Second German Edition. By T. M. Kettle, B.L. London and Freiburg: Herder.

THIS is another indication of the great activity and capacity of Mr. Kettle. There were already a good many books on the Church and Science; but many of them were antiquated, or at least behind the times. Professor Kettle has brought us up, or down, to date in this volume, and has presented, in doing so, English-speaking Catholics with a most useful and interesting book. We meet here names that are new and fresh, and that

bear onward the glorious tradition of the Church in its promotion and cultivation of science.

Father Kneller has classified the great names of recent times ; but he has classified them according to subjects, and has told us what Catholics have distinguished themselves in later times in Mathematics, Astronomy, Physics, Chemistry, Geography, Mineralogy, Geology, Physiology, Zoology, Botany. Whilst revealing to us the achievements of great inventors and investigators in these various fields, Father Kneller imparts a great deal of scientific information in small doses. His work is the best of its kind, and will be found useful in a thousand ways by Catholic apologists and controversialists. Mr. Kettle has rendered an important service to the Catholic Church in translating it so accurately and ably into English. It is a task very few people in this country are equal to, and deserves the more gratitude on that account. There are plenty of people talking and boasting. Mr. Kettle has set himself to work and has done something. He has indeed done many things ; but nothing that indicates his loyalty and devotion to the Catholic Church more fully than a laborious achievement of this kind. An admirable Preface by Father T. A. Finlay, S.J., introduces the volume.

J. F. H.

THE CARLOVIAN. Annual of St. Patrick's College, Carlow.
Dublin : Sealy, Bryers & Walker. 1911.

WE congratulate Rev. P. J. Doyle very sincerely on the revival of the *Carlow Annual*, and on the excellent style in which it reappears. The Editor's influence is felt all through its pages and gives it a bright and breezy originality. The Bishop of Kildare, happily restored to health and vigour, introduces it in an encouraging letter. The articles are well written, and are very varied. A few illustrations would have made the magazine perfect. We have to pay it this little tribute in the midst of many occupations. Though brief it is cordial.

J. F. H.

GEMMA GALGANI. A Child of the Passion. By Philip Coghlan, C.P. London : R. T. Washbourne. 1911.

THE supernatural life that ever burns with a brilliant light in the Catholic Church is revealed once more in this work, the

life of a weak and sorely-trying Italian maiden, who imitated the fervour of St. Francis of Assisi, and like St. Francis was marked with the very *stigmata* of love. It is a most interesting, indeed fascinating, narrative. When one opens it and begins there is no leaving it off until one gets to the end of it. The trials of this poor creature were something frightful, yet she bore them with an ease and grace and resignation that conquers the heart. There was none of the whimsical visionary about Gemma Galgani. She was the genuine lover of the Divine Spouse, who shared His pity and compassion for wayward sinners and did wonders to bring them back to Him.

The work, though not a translation, is borrowed from the Italian, and a little too much borrowed, we should say. For instance, the expression at page 36 attributed to our Lord, has a very unnatural sound in our ears. He is reported to have said to Gemma: 'Do thou on thy part what thou canst. I wish to make use of thee just because thou art the poorest and most sinful of My creatures.' Our Lord is truth itself, and surely He could not have spoken even in rebuke of such a pure and holy person as 'the most sinful of My creatures.'

Again, at page 90 there is a passage which sounds harshly in our theological ear: 'This must indeed be a great sinner. Jesus does not know him. Mary weeps; and Gabriel gives me no answer.'

There are a few other things of this kind: but on the whole the work is most interesting and is well produced.


J. F. H.

SOCIALISM AND THE WORKING-MAN. By R. Fullerton, B.D., B.C.L. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd. 1911.

FATHER FULLERTON does not claim to have written an exhaustive treatise on the doctrines and aims of Socialism; but he has outlined these doctrines and aims in very clear and concise language, and has made on them comments so damaging that they are almost as good as a formal refutation. He makes excellent use of the Encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII. on this subject, the very best lamp that could guide his feet through obscure and rugged paths. The work is such a one as will appeal to many persons who might be inclined to turn towards Socialism. It is not diffuse, nor long-winded, nor high-sounding. It is practical and plain, and will be found most useful in industrial centres, whether in Ireland or outside it. The work at the same

time reveals no small amount of culture and good sense, and indeed a very wide and, for his purpose, exhaustive acquaintance with the literature of the subject. In his chapters on 'Socialism and Religion' and so-called 'Christian Socialism,' Father Fullerton strikes the right key; and his work cannot but do good amongst those who have hazy notions on these subjects. We congratulate him on the service he has done in giving us a most useful and practical book on a subject of such burning interest.

J. F. H.



274.1505

I 68

ser. 4

✓ ~~XXIX~~

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA



3 1262 09628 1596